THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Volume IX APRIL, 1923 Number 2

THE WAY OF GROWTH*

GLENN N. MERRY
University of Iowa

THIS convention will close the eighth year of the National Association of Teachers of Speech. Since no convention was held during the war, this is our seventh annual assembling. To me, as one of the seventeen who deliberated hard and long at that memorable meeting at Chicago in 1914, November 28, before signing the first copy of the constitution, these eight years with seven conventions are filled with significance. Some of our fears of that day were groundless. Some problems quite unforeseen have developed. But in the main, we have adhered to the original statement of our purposes found in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL, Volume I. These were, briefly stated: 1, to promote scholarship; 2, to establish a journal devoted solely to our own problems; 3, to encourage sectional meetings of teachers; and 4, to encourage full coöperation with other departments of academic instruction. The cohesive power of these our purposes has been so great that the national organization seems now, after these eight years, to assume stability and a permanence of character.

While it has not been the custom for the retiring presidents of the Association, since the statement of purposes made by the first president, to offer to the membership points of view based upon their experience, I shall make bold to create an exception. One year's experience as your president and seven years of close con-

*President's Address, delivered at the Seventh Annual Convention of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, New York City, December 27, 1922.

tact with the growth of the Association lead me to believe that stability and permanence of any organization of teachers in our field calls for four realizations; these are:

1. That there is a strong demand in America for some form of speech training in our schools.

2. That we shall meet this demand best by a careful definition of the problem presented.

3. That teachers for academic service must be trained toward an academic point of view.

4. That, as in all human endeavor, organization may prove mutually profitable.

First, there is a strong demand for speech training in our schools which we all feel, although statistics on this subject have not been published. I base my assertion upon conversations with educators who have visited widely, and upon certain developments indicating such a demand. The movement to satisfy this demand is apparent in the increasing oral work in the grades, the change in methods of teaching children how to read and speak, in the oral English of the junior and senior high schools, in the increasing number of city school systems demanding supervisors of speech correction, and in the rapid increase, recently, in publications dealing with some phase of speech. England, also, is experiencing the same demand. The most striking characteristic of the report recently issued by the British Government on the teaching of English in England is the repeated emphatic declarations of need for speech training in the schools. This demand is praiseworthy. American and British boys and girls, men and women, should expect increased power in clear thinking and effective speech as a part of the service of the educational systems of the two countries.

We who assemble here have chosen speech education as our particular form of service to society. We may face frankly these facts first: that we must succeed in meeting this demand for speech training in some form, or else we, in our inability, will be superceded by abler teachers just as we as a group have displaced the well-meaning but improperly directed elocutionist of several decades ago. Second, we shall meet this demand best by carefully defining our problem. No two schools furnish exactly the same demand from the primary grades to the senior year in college. This is because of differences in students' innate abilities, and of the

varying advantages of the student's home environment, together with the nature of the school itself. The demand, broadly considered, is for increased power in self expression, in oral communication of ideas. And all the handicaps that either the student's innate ability or the deficiencies of the home place upon him, become problems for the teacher of speech. There exist, therefore, lines of training which seek to improve the student in the ability to think into speech in the presence of other people, to coördinate for effective communication his voice and body with his ideas, to improve agreeableness in response both vocal and bodily, to improve distinctness of utterance of acceptable diction, and in a smaller percentages of cases to try to improve the student's speech by eliminating major defects, physical and functional.

A quest for information as to how to proceed best in training, leads us to our own experience in speech development and to the experiences of those who have written about the sciences and arts involving speech. There are three specific objectives involving thought for which we must train: (a) We must enable students to improve in the expression of their own ideas,—public speaking and conversation; (b) in reading the words of another whether in public or in private; and (c) in acting out upon the stage the thought of another. Each of these activities employs the entire human organism. Mind, voice, and body function coördinately. And since speech is always inseparable from language, knowledge of words and their relationships becomes also an element in our problem. So that we may say teachers of speech have a wide field, a field offering advantages in and inducements toward specialization. The teacher must touch the fields of knowledge involved in

Psychology in its broader meaning
Physiology
Physics
Phonetics
Rhetoric
Dramatics
Literature.

A careful definition of our task should not lead us to a foolish assumption that we should master the whole fields represented by these seven subjects. Life is too brief. Like those who developed the fields of Physics and Physiology, we should draw from the older subjects for our particular purposes. Knowledge is not divided into compartments. The physicist must be a mathematician, the physiologist a chemist. The teacher of speech must be acquainted, to some

degree, with an understanding of what older subjects have to offer that is helpful. Our specific field exists *in discovering among the laws of these old subjects newer adaptations to speech training.*

And so we find in convention this morning a group of teachers and scholars whose greatest purpose is strictly educational, namely, to enable the youth of America to give more effective expression to its ideas; but who as specialists in this broad field are more definitely interested in public speech, public reading, dramatic production, and speech correction as forms of applied science or art. I cannot evaluate one interest as supreme over another. They are not comparable. All are necessary and when properly coördinated can achieve for America a program of speech education worthy of the best efforts of any man or woman seeking to invest his life in public service.

Third, the teachers must be academically trained. Teachers for American colleges and high schools should be trained in these schools. I do not say that they should not be trained elsewhere also. But at least their training should encompass that demanded of any other teacher in our schools. The elocutionist failed in high schools and colleges because the elocutionist's training was not of a scholastic nature. The elocutionist's training was more an end toward an artistic career upon the stage. It was self-centered. The elocutionist's personal power in speech was mistaken for ability to teach. Some elocutionists were great teachers, most of them were not. The academic point of view changes the emphasis from that of imitation of the artist, solely, to the consideration of the student's needs and potentialities. And the academically trained teacher understands as the elocutionist never could, *how to coördinate his instruction with the whole program of education.*

While our chief problem is the training of others, we must not overlook the fact that we as teachers must train ourselves also. No teacher should deny himself time for further investigation along the lines of his personal interests. Sound scholarship united with skill and general good judgement cannot but improve the teaching ability of any school man or woman. We must guard only against the two extremes of scholarship to the exclusion of practical application in some form, on the one hand, and methodology built up out of ignorance or imitation on the other.

And fourth, as in all human endeavor, organization should

prove mutually profitable. I am ready to raise the interrogation—why have a national organization? I can think of each man or woman interested solely in his own institution and thoroughly oblivious to the conditions in any other school. I can see such a type of worker developing a high regard for his own experience and a suspicion and distrust of the work of colleagues. Out of such conditions grow "systems" of instruction, secrets of speech education carefully swaddled in provincial naiveté. Yet, with the enlarging scope of our national organization, I have seen *good* "systems" discover striking resemblances in each other and become, as they should be, common knowledge in methodology, the heritage of the scholar or academic teacher. I have seen men and women from north and south, east and west, once distrustful of one another, develop mutual regard by association at our conventions. I have seen the teachers of public speaking, dramatic production, interpretative reading, and speech correction find helpful support in each other's fields. And I have seen the teacher most interested in the scientific background of his work develop respect for the teacher whose major opportunity is the training of others. There is neither east nor west, north nor south, when genuine teachers and scholars meet face to face in convention assembled.

Organization results in comparison of ideas and ideals. Comparison results in discussion, assent, and dissent. Discussion results in group standards emphasizing the right and disregarding the wrong. Organization must result in the promotion of acceptable standards and the neglect of the impulsive, or superficial. Organization is, therefore, a mutual benefit to the strong and a professional protection against the sensationalist. Only through organization can we deal with problems of nominal standardization of courses, with the proper safeguarding of extra curricular contests against encroaching evils of so-called professionalism, and with problems involving a professional or scholastic attitude. The strongest teacher helps the weaker, the conservative checks the radical, the scholar embarrasses the self-satisfied dabbler in knowledge; in short, experienced teachers stimulate the inexperienced.

Let me call attention to the program offered at this convention. It is a coöperative effort. In formulating it specialists in each of our fields have been called into service. I have frankly set forth what I believe to be the only lines upon which a *national* organiza-

tion can progress. The specialist in dramatic production must find a program for his own problems exclusively; and the same is true of the teacher in speech correction, or in public speaking. Yet each must feel kinship and fellowship.

Geographically, this convention represents the most national gathering we have ever had. Not only is the Eastern Conference joining with the National, but also the New England Conference; although the name of the New England Conference does not appear upon our program due to delayed mail carrying such authorization.

So I offer as your retiring president this thought; that our work is demanded, that our best knowledge and skill is demanded and that our educational service can be improved through our fostering a national, academic, professional association which shall coöperate fully with sectional and state organizations, either independently or by affiliation.

And I make the following recommendations, based upon my year's intimate knowledge of the needs of the Association:

1. That in addition to our regular officers elected annually, we create a permanent Executive Committee composed of the past presidents, and three elected members who shall hold office for three years, one member's term expiring annually.

2. That we create standing, or permanent, committees for an indefinite period of service, on

Investigation and Research
American Speech
Student honor public speaking Societies.

3. That we encourage state organizations to affiliate with the National.

4. That we create a membership committee which shall serve for a period of three years.

5. And that we classify memberships in the National Association as follows, with dues as assigned, each membership including, of course, annual subscription to THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION.

A. *Membership* $2.50 for the first year.
B. *Sustaining Membership,* $10.
C. *Life Membership,* $100.

I need not add that the officers of the organizations meeting jointly to-day bid you welcome and that they trust this meeting will be memorably profitable to all.

SPEECH DISTURBANCES IN NERVOUS AND MENTAL DISEASES*

By A. A. BRILL, M. D.
New York City

SPEECH disturbances have been thoroughly studied by a great many observers. The neurologists and psychiatrists have always recognized the peculiarities of speech in paralysis agitans, epilepsy, paresis and other organic disturbances. Somewhat later speech peculiarities were also noted in the functional nervous diseases. It is of the latter that I wish to speak.

I became directly interested in speech disturbances in 1908 when I first met Dr. E. W. Scripture at the Vanderbilt Clinic, New York City, with which we were both connected. I well recall how he soon found that the mechanical treatment or the training of the speech organs alone did not suffice, and we then collaborated in a number of cases. He looked after the phonetic or the speech correction as such, while I attended to the mental and emotional elements of the patient. We had fair results in the few cases we studied together. Since then I have been actively interested in the treatment and study of speech disturbances. Like everyone else I was very enthusiastic in the beginning when I saw the remarkable improvement in some of the patients. My enthusiasm declined with the length of my experience and with the number of cases. I am not, however, pessimistic.

Let us first discuss stuttering. On looking over my records I find that I have seen over six hundred cases since 1908, of which I treated sixty-nine. That is, I saw the patients regularly for a few months to a year or even longer. All of these patients were educated adults ranging from the ages of fifteen to fifty-one, of the better class. Most of them left me feeling satisfied that they were either very much improved or cured. I always ask all my patients

* Read before the National Association of Teachers of Speech, on December 27, 1922, New York University.

to communicate with me at least once a year in order to know whether the treatment had a permanent or only a temporary effect, so that I have a good record of all my cases up to date. I have also observed a great many younger patients ranging from the ages of four to eighteen, or have supervised their treatment. Most of my patients were males. The ratio was four males to one female patient, which is perhaps unusual in psychoneuroses where the feminine sex preponderates. I have been somewhat puzzled about the preponderance of male stutterers but I think we can venture at least a tentative explanation.

It has always been asserted that women were more voluble than men. There is no question about it. This would mean that women have had either more practice in the development of their speech, or that speech is normally easier for them, or both. Many discussions and explanations have been offered about woman's expertness in speech. Thus Jespersen, the famous philologist, states that "the superior readiness of speech of women is a concomitant of the fact that their vocabulary is smaller and more central than that of men"..... "the highest linguistic genius and the lowest degree of linguistic imbecility are very rarely found among women. The greatest orators, the most famous literary artists, have been men."[1] This author agrees with Havelock Ellis that this is not a slur on women but that it simply shows that there is a greater variability of the male sex, that whereas the latter shows great orators, it also shows a much greater number of men than women "who cannot put two words together intelligibly, who stutter, stammer, and hesitate, and are unable to find suitable expressions for the simplest thoughts."[2] In brief, it may be said that as man is normally less fluent in his speech than woman, he shows a greater preponderance of speech disturbances. It is known that in psychopathology, as in normal traits of character, there is a certain selectiveness when it comes to the formation of symptoms. In the mating partnership where each sex has different functions to perform, men and women have developed into two entirely different beings as far as reaction to environment is concerned. The male animal is actively aggressive, he is the procreator and provider.

[1] Jespersen, "Language, Its Nature, Development, and Origin," p. 253, Henry Holt & Co., N. Y.

[2] Jespersen, 1, c.

Having performed these functions for thousands of years he has developed into a more or less quiet, suspicious, aggressive being. When he was foraging and warring as a primitive, he was forced to scheme, concentrate, and remain silent. To talk much was impossible because deep mental concentration precludes talking, and it would have been dangerous to make himself heard. Modern man differs little in this regard. Present day competition with his fellow beings demands all his mental efforts and leaves him little time for speech. On the other hand the female animal is passive and receptive, she naturally mates with the most aggressive male, conceives, bears, and nurtures the child until it becomes more or less independent. She has thus developed attributes fitting her for these special tasks. Her sexual demands are entirely different from those of the man with whom the act of procreation is practically the end aim. To sense the needs of the child her perceptions are keener albeit somewhat superficial. A woman sees, hears, etc., quicker than a man, but has not the capacity for profound elaboration; she has no need for deep thinking in her constant relations with the simple human being, the child, to whose level she readily descends. Women of today, like their more primitive sisters, can cook, bake, crochet, and talk at the same time, and giving so much time to the child with whom she babbles and teaches to talk, she has thus developed her own speech. The preponderance of speech disturbance as a psychoneurotic symptom in males is thus only an exaggeration of a normal activity. In man speech is a reaction to a deeper mental process than in women. Women are quicker to perceive things and express them through speech because the thoughts do not encounter as much criticism as in man; hence their speech is more fluent and not as vulnerable as in man.

As I said before, my enthusiasm declined with time. After about eleven years I found that only five of the sixty-nine patients discharged by me were really well. One of these patients was perfectly well for four and a half years, until the war broke out and he was summoned before the board of examiners. He became very nervous and began to stutter as badly as he ever did. I succeeded in quieting him, but he stuttered pretty badly until the armistice was signed. This as you see is a small percentage of cures. Most of the others seem to be satisfied that they have improved, although they have their ups and downs. I have seen a great many

other patients who have been treated and cured by others who fared no better than my patients. As a matter of fact I could be very busy if I cared to take all the stutterers who have already been cured by others. There is no royal road to the treatment of stuttering. I do not care by what method it is attacked.

But what does it mean when we hear that so many honest, conscientious people claim to cure from forty to eighty percent of their cases. I cannot accuse them of deliberate misrepresentations, they undoubtedly tell the truth as they see it. Their patients may have been young children who can usually be cured if treated properly. Like every other psychoneurotic symptom, speech disturbances can be cured quicker and more thoroughly when it has not become interwoven in the whole being of the person. There is another type of patient who is curable, who in my opinion is not a true stutterer. I refer to quite a number of depressed patients of the manic-depressive type of insanity who stammered and stuttered during the mild attacks of depression but who usually became normal with the termination of the attack, treated or not treated. I have seen only two cases, one a rather hysterical woman who continued the speech disturbance after the depression disappeared. When such patients are treated, they are usually cured, but they often relapse. That was undoubtedly the case with the patient who returned to his speech disturbance when he was afraid of being sent to the front.[3]

Another group of curable stutterers are psychoneurotics who began to stutter at a later age, as illustrated in the following case. X. was an only child of a neurotic family, who was quite precocious mentally. From early boyhood he was more or less of a sufferer. He had all diseases of childhood and was very nervous besides, but he did quite well until about the age of puberty. At thirteen years he began to show symptoms of an anxiety hysteria, from which he suffered when he came to me at sixteen years. He then showed attacks of anxiety with palpitation and respiratory disturbances, some vague phobias, such as fears of death and insanity, and a marked stuttering. At times he could hardly talk; he made many efforts to speak, but unlike many stutterers, he showed no facial

[3] For further references to manic-depressive insanity, see my book, "*Fundamental Conceptions of Psychoanalysis*," Harcourt Brace Co., N. Y.

contortions; he simply forced himself to push out some sounds from his throat, which came out laboriously, beginning with "ah ah ah."

Analysis showed that the speech disturbance began only about six months previously, but gradually became worse. Without going into any details of the case, I will state that his speech troubles always played quite a part in his life. His mother told me that he did not begin to speak until almost three years old, but then he made up for it. He was the greatest talker she ever heard, and his paternal grandfather, in whose home the parents lived, was extremely anoyed by his constant talking and screaming; the little fellow was forever told to be quiet and not to talk so much. At times he had to be sent up to a room on the third floor because his grandfather could not tolerate his noisy talking. When he was punished or when his wishes were not gratified, he had a habit of holding his breath, until "he was blue in the face" and cried for hours. The history elicited from the patient himself showed that when he began to go to school, he again had trouble with his talking. He either talked too much or too loud and was often punished for it. The immediate precipitating cause of his symptom was a quarrel between himself and his father, whom he disliked since his boyhood; while the definite determinants of his neurosis were a number of emotional experiences of a sexual nature. The symptom was a regression to the infantile when he was backward in his speech, and was urged, begged, and bribed to talk; at that time he realized that his speech was a weapon which he could use to gain favors from his father, who forced him to go to a school he disliked, and again he gained his point through the use of his speech. I cured him in a few months and he has been well for a number of years.

Such cases are quite common. There is still a third group of cases, psychopaths and mild defectives, in whom one observes transient speech disturbances. These too can be "cured," but they always relapse. It is my opinion that it is these groups that give the high percentages of cures, but who undoubtedly relapse sooner or later. I do not call a case cured unless the patient shows no relapse for at least five years.

Why is it so difficult to cure stutterers? The real stutterers, I mean those who claim they have always suffered from a speech disturbance, are most difficult to cure, because any treatment given them would have to be extended over a long period of time. There is

no question in my mind that stuttering is a psychoneurotic symptom. Consequently we have to treat them as chronic psychoneurotics. When a chronic psychoneurotic applies to me for treatment, I always tell him that he should expect no improvement for six months, and that it may take a year or longer. The stutterers that have remained well now over ten years have been treated by me from a year and a half to three years. That may sound too long; but I do not think that one can do very much better with these cases. I feel that it is distinctly wrong to encourage a chronic stutterer by telling him that he will be cured in a few weeks or in a few months. I have never seen one so cured, and I frankly doubt any reports to the contrary. Moreover most stutterers that I have observed were not just pure psychoneurotics; they belonged to a paranoid type; that is, they were people who were shut-in, secluded from the very beginning of their existence, and who on analysis showed autoerotic and narcissistic fixations.[4] It would be impossible to go into the details of treatment. I always insist on training; because the patients have acquired bad habits of speech, which should be corrected. But I lay the greatest stress on the psychic treatment. I analyze the patient thoroughly just as I analyze any neurosis, and continue with them for a long time until they feel that they are improving. I discharge them only when I am convinced that I have freed them from their inhibitions. Speech disturbances disappear when the individual feels free to express himself; that is, when he can give and take emotions in a normal way. One must remember that the neurotic symptom is, as it were, a morbid gain for the patient, and unconsciously he refuses to give it up. Chronic stutterers, like other chronic, neurotics make use of their stuttering to escape from all kinds of difficulties. Stutterers the world over, stutter most when they are confronted with disagreeable tasks, and a great many of them that have remained cured for years relapse when confronted with a painful situation. So that our treatment consists in showing the patient how to face reality.

Perhaps more important than treatment is prophylaxis. I

[4] Those who are interested in such mechanisms I refer to my two books: *"Fundamental Conceptions of Psychoanalysis,"* Harcourt Brace, N. Y., and *"Psychoanalysis, Its Theories and Applications,"* W. B. Saunders, Phila.

have seen a great many young children who began to show signs of stuttering at a very early age. A thorough study of the environments, that is, the behavior of the parents towards the child, and bringing the child in contact with other children, should usually remove the difficulty. In some, the child had to be seen and trained, but one must be very careful not to impress the child that it has a malady and thus cause a self-consciousness which is hard to eliminate. Most of these children belong to the psychopathic type, and are somewhat burdened by heredity. The usual care given to children of that type must be borne in mind in the treatment; it is not just a question of correcting speech; one must remember that there are also some speech disturbances in children and adults which do not manifest themselves in an inability to utter correct words and syllables. I have seen some children whose flight of ideas were such that they could not produce corresponding words to express them; they belong to the manic depressive types; others belong to the praecox types and show the characteristic poverty of expression. All these mechanisms have to be considered in the treatment of young people suffering from speech disturbances.

To sum up, there is no royal road to the treatment of speech disturbances. It is the most difficult neurosis that one has to manage. There are very few cures affected among the adult chronic stutterers. Most of the so-called cases are of a temporary nature. Our main reliance should be in prophylaxis. When confronted with the adult stutterers there is no use of resorting to untruths in the form of suggestion. Suggestion does not work with those chronic cases who have been promised cures over and over again. They must be impressed that they have a long road to travel in order to become cured, and unless they are very anxious and willing to undertake it, they should not be treated.

GRADUATE WORK IN PUBLIC SPEAKING*

A. M. DRUMMOND
Cornell University

IN concluding a noteworthy paragraph of an address delivered before one of our first conventions, Professor O'Neill, then president of the Association, said: "the future of our profession lies in the class-room and the study." And I can do no better than enlarge on this thought, as doubtless he would have done, had it not been his purpose in discussing "The Professional Outlook" at that time to amplify other topics.

For, as with all academic teachers, the chief purpose of our graduate study is to influence the class-room; and the work of the class-room will not be improved without advanced study on a considerable scale. The level of professional efficiency or preparation cannot be soundly or appreciably raised except by the slow process of educating individual teachers, and by such a general improvement in standards that only those who possess the ability which comes from wise and ample preparation and continuing scholarly activity will find positions open to them.

Graduate study in public speaking is well established, though relatively new. But we should constantly remember that while advanced degrees are a recognition of academic progress, and that although in the job-market an advanced degree is here and there a necessary "open sesame," these degrees are a grave responsibility. Their value will be judged by the personality, character, and evident training of those who receive them. This test is apt to be more strictly applied as our degrees are more extensively conferred.

This responsibility is, of course, well recognized by those who have faced the problem of conducting our graduate work. I should like then briefly to consider matters possibly more interesting to

*Members of the Association who are interested will be sent a copy of this list on request.

those already in the profession who find themselves unable to work for degrees in our field, even during the summer sessions, but who wish to do something for themselves and the standing of their departments and the profession. Many of these colleagues are located where they may take graduate work in other departments: work which may be as fruitful and as sound as any work for a degree in public speaking or speech education—in rhetoric, language, psychology, pedagogy, English literature and criticism, and other related sciences and arts. Such colleagues may be encouraged by these facts: that most of the members of our profession now conducting graduate work do so under guerdon of graduate work done and advanced degrees obtained in other departments; that work done in departments of older and more developed organization will be insurance of sound work and will be recognized as such, thus in many cases adding an academic prestige not everywhere yet granted to our own degrees; that there are many excellent dissertations and studies directly useful to us, which have been developed under related departments. Time forbids that I mention even the most striking studies: in the origin and psychology of expression and of gesture; in the bases of opinion and the form and influence of oral discussion; in the history and theories of our subjects, from antiquity to the present day; in voice science; in psychology of reading; in aesthetics; in the development of physical expression; in language and speech. A number of these in a special field were mentioned last year by Professor Shorey. THE QUARTERLY has reviewed or mentioned enough others to make it unnecessary to dwell upon this point.

Beyond this favorably situated group are many of our best teachers who are out of touch with universities and graduate schools. These must do their advanced work without the impulse given by the companionship of fellow students and while far removed from the stimulating atmosphere of great universities. From teachers and students thus situated should come some of our best work, for they should constantly remember that advanced study and research is a highly personal matter, depending on the interest and stamina of one rather than of many, and that a degree represents chiefly this: that an individual has the "intellectual viscera" to tackle a hard problem and carry on to a worthy conclusion. The fruits of such accomplishment are easily recognized everywhere and valued by all whose judgment is worth considering.

It is "study"—advanced study—that will give enduring satisfactions, will convince the omnipresent sceptic that we know our business, will enable us to take rank with those who know in other fields, will mitigate the grind of drill, will enable us perhaps to illumine by a word or a reference the path of the willing and intelligent student, will add to the growing content of our field, will enable us to assimilate the labor of workers in other fields to our own, will give us some sense of the power that comes with knowledge, will give us increased dignity, will enable us to "play the academic game,"—and win "recognition" where we still need and can deserve recognition. Nor can we doubt that it will enable us to offer fuller preparation and wiser training to those now entering the profession than were offered us.

If I had one primary and practical suggestion for these scholars—and indeed for all of our profession—it might be this: that, along with a goodly number of the world's great books, there falls clearly within our field one of the great treatises on education; and I may add that it relates to a comprehensive scheme of education in our subject—and of education in general—all the important academic subjects I have heard discussed in the conventions of this association, and, I fancy, most that will ever be here discussed. This book might well be more thoroughly the basis of all our thinking. It is Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*—the *Education of the Orator.*

Only the other day I heard one of the ablest teachers of the English language and literature in the country say that if he had one book to recommend to teachers of English, of composition, of speaking—he is a teacher of English interested in oral expression—he would recommend Quintilian, not alone for ideas, for theory for soundness and comprehensiveness, but as well for lucid amplification and readable quality. Lest any should be prejudiced against the opinion of a scholar and teacher of English, I have described him by his full and consciously chosen title—in which there may be a moral for us—of Professor of the English Language and Literature.

It is not my purpose to discuss debatable matters in the field of graduate work, but there is no evading the fact that all differences of opinion in our work become most acute when we consider problems of graduate study and its organization. We should remember, however, that we discuss the same questions that confront

graduate schools everywhere in handling work of practically all departments, especially since the rise of graduate study in technological subjects and for vocational degrees.

Is there not danger of over-specialization in undergraduate preparation for specific graduate study? Shall training for personal proficiency rank with acquisition of knowledge? What shall be the appropriate content, or appropriate discipline, of graduate study? Shall technological science rank with pure science? Shall broad training come first, and intensive investigation of a specific thesis problem come second? Or shall the dissertation be depended upon to furnish sufficient breadth of training? Shall graduate faculties be divided on a basis of general "fields of knowledge" requiring the coöperation of the separate departments working within these "fields" in organizing and determining the standards of graduate study in the several departments involved? Shall a student be permitted to choose a minor subject falling within the department responsible for the major subject, or must minors be taken in another department? Shall candidates for advanced degrees be subject to examination by a group larger than their special committee —perhaps a committee representing the larger "field of knowledge?" Shall graduate work represent a period of study devoted primarily to the acquisition of knowledge; or shall it be a definite practical training for a specific vocation? Shall work for advanced degrees be adjusted to the needs of those wishing a personal skill in professions other than teaching,—engineering, architecture, platform speaking; or shall personal skill be largely a by-product of more "academic" disciplines—a reasonable proficiency perhaps made prerequisite to candidacy, and some developing skill regarded as perhaps necessary to make knowledge vivid?

Shall there be multiplication of advanced degrees, i. e., Master of Civil Engineering, of Forestry, of Domestic Science, of Economics, of Oratory, of Oral English, of Public Speaking, of Speech, —or shall work in specialties represented by such terms as these be subsumed under the titles of Master of Arts and Master of Science? Shall it be Doctor of Public Speaking, of Rhetoric, of Speech,—or Doctor of Philosophy? Shall advanced work for teachers be technological, normal training, or rather largely cultural, dealing with background, standards, emphasizing the subject, rather than how to teach the subject? Such questions are definitely before us, in the

relation of teachers' colleges to the work of graduate schools.

These are but a few of the problems. There are and will be differences of opinion. Circumstances may dictate practice. Can we not agree to emphasize knowledge without neglecting the importance of the acquisition of personal skill as having a distinct place not only in our own work, but in a proper scheme of general education?

All such questions figure largely in the councils of university graduate faculties, and in most departments of colleges of liberal arts. More and more they vex technical schools which grant advanced degrees. They have for us, in respect to skill and knowledge, very interesting analogies in architecture, fine arts, music, English, economics, and physics. Many of the questions will doubtless remain contested. Different schools will represent different beliefs and will serve different needs, holding to somewhat different ideals and practices in graduate work. And students will go to different schools as their interests dictate. The character and aims of schools will change too. I see no possible proper process of attempting standardization. But there is every reason for free and open discussion and thorough agreement on high standards.

Requirements for the Master's and Doctor's degrees differ, and these differences demand serious consideration. Shall the Master's degree, for example, represent a general broad training in the field and some of its varied parts by an arrangement of *courses,* or shall emphasis be placed, as for the Doctorate, on special investigation leading to a Master's thesis? There is sound precedent for both plans. Or can the merits of various plans be combined? Shall the Ph. D. represent, first, broad training in the field, and, within that, specialization in some investigation leading to a dissertation? Or shall broad training be rather represented by two minor subjects in fields other than the major subject?

These questions have added interest for us because they imply a possible decision on what general "field of knowledge" might claim our work in any such adjustment. Off hand, one would say that of course our work would be grouped with English language and literature. But already the present status of our graduate work suggests a number of other possible alignments. It is doubtful whether speech training, speech correction, and dramatic art, for example, would, in many schools, be grouped with English.

Already graduate work at some universities falls within "fields" quite different from the "field" claiming our work elsewhere. Here it may fall with English, there with psychology and pedagogy, at another institution with still another "field" or group of departments.

Of course, the larger "the fields of knowledge" the more they would interlace. After all, "the field of knowledge" is to some degree not unlike a university department,—a rather arbitrary division in an unperfected world. Still some of these developments might make a pretty study in organization, and here and there the decision would be highly important to our work and largely determined by its character and direction, not only in general, but at specific times and at particular institutions. Such differences in organization may, unless we are watchful, develop within our Association unnecessary and unfortunate controversies resulting from these different angles of approach, and from the natural pride that each has in his own organization.

It is possible that, within the purview of graduate administration, rhetoric and speech might be a "field of knowledge," and if so, surely more power to us. But if any administration makes such a decision in haste, I "hae ma douts" that our best right arm could as hastily acquire the power or length easily to embrace the amplitude of this embarrassingly corpulent Minerva.

Perhaps most of these problems are problems of the future. But they are already interestingly on the horizon. Obviously we cannot decide them here. Local circumstances may be compelling on individual departments. Other ideals and purposes than our own may persuasively influence our individual or collective decision.

But, so far as it is not a matter of organization, it is obvious that graduate work will be conducted by those teachers prepared and in a position to do so according to their own training and interest, and will develop to meet the needs of particular situations as this training and interest permit, or as other scholars and teachers can be slowly trained to meet new needs. "Standardization" is hardly to be thought of—though general agreement on aims and standards might possibly be approximated by discussion. There might be agreement on organization without concurrence of opinion on the proper "content" of graduate work in general. The appropriate

"content" of graduate work in speech training and speech correction, in public speaking, debate and oral discussion, in interpretative reading, in dramatic art, or in language, might have comparatively little common ground from the point of view of specialization, except the common ground of interest in delivery and in the "Mother Tongue"—if indeed there be any common ground of interest even in "delivery," unless the term be very loosely defined. To determine the general training—even the fundamental elementary discipline—appropriate for graduate work in our increasingly varied specialization, training which should be fundamental for sound specialization later and anywhere, is an important subject for deliberation.

But if we could standarize to suit me—if I knew what would suit me—even then, I would wish time which I have not, to digress to an appeal against attempts to standardize or to agree except on the broadest essentials of spirit, when we can know so little of each other's practical situation or impelling motives, when we must each succeed in his own way at home before we can recommend to others our successful developments, and when what each builds well is there creditably established for all to use. Thus only will we progress, and perhaps agree—we or those who follow us—even in present disagreement preserving the free spirit of scientific inquiry, of advancing knowledge, of professional democracy, liberality, and fair-mindedness. If this is not the spirit of graduate study, then it will deserve the harshest condemnations laid on narrowing vocational education.

To debate any proposition here might tend to rob the proving grounds of library, study, laboratory, and class-room of just responsibility and merited reward, but I might lend some concreteness to our thinking by briefly stating our point of view and general organization at Cornell, especially as it relates to the preparation we would think desirable for a student entering upon graduate work, and as it relates to the general aim and scope of our graduate training under our present departmental organization. I shall hold no brief for our work, but shall describe the situation, which may seem to you better or worse.

We should like a student to have had general academic, "liberal arts" training:—the usual general requirements of the now somewhat old-fashioned "college," if you please,—with his full

share of English, of language, both ancient and modern, history, some philosophy, economics and social sciences, some pure science, perhaps some fine art,—training supposed to lead to some historical and literary sense, to sound judgment in weighing facts in some field or another, to good taste. We should especially like the student to have a good background for language study: some ability to pick up a scientific point of view; as wide reading as it is reasonable to expect; some idea of the problems of the modern world; less fear of the library than most of us have; some ability to analyze and work up a special subject—in short,—or long!—that general training and attitude of mind, both academic and practical, which a man hopes to acquire from general academic training. A large order? Yes! Possible? At least it is easy now-a-days to get a very different training! Do we get it? Not always, but perhaps more often than one might expect.

We should not insist upon any considerable undergraduate work in speaking. Two full-year three-hour courses well selected would be ample. Twenty hours on the semester system the limit. We should not care whether or not the candidate were a conspicuous winner of contests, or a crack debater, or actor. Often enough we would look with suspicion on such honors if won at cost of more academic achievement. We should expect him to speak and read fairly well. We should expect him to write reasonably well—as well as a student in a similar position in English. We should wish to have an instructor competent to be an instructor in English—and possessing a natural interest in, and preparation for, teaching public speaking.

In order to get our point of view, we should expect the student, even as a graduate, to follow—and if he had not had the equivalent, to take—our fundamental course in public speaking. This is a course which is open to sophomores, but which has always counted for upper-class credit in the English-Public Speaking group for undergraduate majors. In some cases he might get the equivalent in advanced public speaking, which he would be required to take for at least one term. Either as a graduate or undergraduate, a student should take a thorough course in voice training. One semester in rhetorical theory, another in the literature of public address, and a seminar in which he would report on special problems and on the progress of his thesis would complete his courses in the

Department of Public Speaking. At Cornell our work for the Master's degree is on the "baby Ph. D." plan. The student would therefore take a minor in another department. This arrangement we welcome, as it forces the student to take a broader point of view, enables him to elect some of the best teachers in the university; and has the opportunist advantage of allowing other departments to test the caliber of our graduates and our own work. If a student is a ranking student in another department, there is little disposition to feel that he is not doing the right sort of work in his major subject, or that his major is the wrong sort of work. If he is teaching, there is confidence that he is teaching sensible work sensibly.

We have been able to arrange joint dissertation subjects for the Doctorate so that work done crosses departmental lines to the student's and to our satisfaction, and to the student's real advantage. If our work is good, the right to the Doctorate will come to us naturally and without question. Personally, I feel that this is a good arrangement for the student, and it enables us to build without haste and without worry.

Within this arrangement of fundamental courses in voice training, public speaking, advanced public speaking, rhetoric, literature of public address, seminar, thesis, and graduate minor in another department, emphasis can readily be placed on some specialization. The student can turn toward speech training by emphasizing voice training and speech improvement, taking advanced voice training and principles of speech correction, and principles and practice in reading. Our present arrangements for work in speech training are naturally planned for prospective secondary school or normal school teachers, and in these branches of study our curriculum is strongest during summer school. The student can emphasize study for debate, discussion, and dialectic. He can lay stress on composition, persuasion, and types of public address. He can emphasize dramatic interpretation and do practical laboratory work with our Dramatic Club and the Campus Theatre. His thesis may perhaps reflect his special interest. As do all other departments, I suppose, we base all specialization on a general fundamental training—according to our idea of what this should be. We hold all students to a common ground of rhetorical training.

At Cornell undergraduate courses in public speaking are of-

fered in sophomore and upperclass years. Most of our Cornell undergraduates will have had some English, history, and economics —many of them some post-freshman English. Our first course in public speaking has counted without questioning in the upperclass group. An undergraduate may take "honors" as in any other department, and may present a senior thesis in public speaking for three to six hours undergraduate credit, under the usual rules governing the standing of candidates for honors and senior thesis credit.

But we advise an undergraduate intending to pursue graduate work to avoid over-specialization in our department and urge him to emphasize general training, not failing to recognize the importance of the study of languages as background and as apparatus for any work in speech and rhetoric.

Our summer session courses and graduate work are naturally planned somewhat more for secondary school teachers. There is opportunity for more emphasis on speech training and principles of voice training and reading, on speech correction, and on play-production. But we hold to the fundamental training in rhetoric in graduate work and, for the present, propose that thesis subjects shall have some relation to rhetorical study.

Terms are bug-a-boos, and have perhaps taken an undue share of our attention. It might, however, be in place to suggest that by rhetoric we mean that this term connotes to one of classical training—properly it includes plan and organization of speeches, study and application of the principles of persuasion, some knowledge of the content and thus of the background and examples drawn from types of public discourse, language, style, and delivery, the oral interpretation of literature, voice training for the normal voice and its improvement, correction of defects (where they do not present very special problems, and then sound advice as to where to seek further aid), the art of oral dramatic interpretation as it bears upon the problem of delivery. Perhaps the final and best test of all these aspects of rhetoric is a certain "public" ability.

This is the traditional field of rhetoric. Its importance as a repository of training, theory, and experience in developing oral expression is being today reëmphasized by such English scholars as Charles Sears Baldwin, and by the great and scholarly English Commission on *The Teaching of English in England.* Many

English departments now sedulously keep the term *rhetoric* out of their announcements,—this at a time when many English scholars and teachers are urging the importance of a return to oral expression, oral composition, and *communication.* Rhetoric is our traditional field, and at Cornell we like to consider it one of the best approaches to every phase of our subject.

We need a comprehensive bibliography, perhaps modeled on Gayley and Scott's *Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism* (Ginn & Co., 1901). We need suggested lists of proper subjects for advanced study with bibliographies for beginners, or lists made by those able and willing to furnish any who are interested with suggestions and references for study. THE QUARTERLY might well, through the activity of the Research Committee, publish a considerable list of such subjects with bibliographical references and print more extended descriptive bibliographies in general fields of research.

As a tentative and rather hastily planned step in this direction members of the department at Cornell have prepared a list of possible subjects for papers, thesis, and research—some of them would keep a man busy for a life time.* This compilation will be suggestive for advanced study. It also helps to define the type of work we have to date most developed. You will recall the excellent lists of possible research studies compiled by Professor Gaylord, Dr. Blanton, and Dr. Woolbert which appeared some years ago in THE QUARTERLY. This list is planned to be supplementary to the other suggestions that have been published. We have not attempted to touch upon the fields of such specialists, even where as a department we have common interests, and might make suggestions. Could not they and other specialists be persuaded to present additional programs of research for our common benefit?

In conclusion, then, let us encourage in every possible way advanced study within our membership—the more graduate study for advanced degrees the better—but advanced study. Especially let us give much thought to the preparation of those intending to teach, and give them sound advice, as well as inspiration. The form of our discipline is a great study, and is illumined by a dignified and noble substance. In addition to his general and his special technique, the teacher of speech training has before him the great study of language in all its aspects; the teacher of reading

the best of artistic literature; the teachers of debate, of public speaking, of dramatics, great special literatures to enrich their thinking, form their technique, vivify their teaching, and dignify their professional lives.

Surely we need not fear we shall be "dry-as-dusts" so long as it is our task to teach the communication of the living thought, through the living word, to the living hearer.

SOME SUBJECTS FOR GRADUATE STUDY SUGGESTED BY MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SPEAKING OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY

THIS list of subjects is suggestive only, and by no means pretends to be exhaustive. The wording in all cases is only tentative; the subjects overlap and are interrelated. Many of them can be approached in several ways, many can be treated in relation to or as subordinate to others in the list. Some of the subjects are appropriate for comparatively short papers, others may suggest material for the doctorial dissertation or other extended research. All should repay investigation.

1 Formulation of a theory of public discourse as drawn from outstanding essays, treatises, and speeches, with examples.
2 Rhetoric as one of the seven liberal arts—its place in the liberal arts curriculum.
3 Contributions to the theory of rhetoric by the Roman and Greek minor rhetoricians, such as Alcidamas, Plutarch, Hermogenes, Anaxamones, Gregory of Corinth, Aristides, Longinus, Theon, Alexander, Tiberius.
4 The rhetorical structure of the speeches of Thucydides and others.
5 Fronto and rhetoric.
6 Contributions of the sophists to eloquence.
7 Treatises on sermon making in the Middle Ages.
8 Comparative study of Quintilian, Cicero, and Seneca.
9 Rhetoric and Logic.

10 Rhetoric and dialectic.
11 Rhetoric and Probability.
12 Debate in ancient rhetoric and oratory.
13 Invention and deliberative oratory (including a discussion of the use of topics).
14 Rhetoric in the Greek and Roman historians and dramatists.
15 History of the feud between philosophy and rhetoric.
16 Historical study of the treatment of content by rhetoricians and teachers of public speaking.
17 Historical study of rhetoric of declamation as opposed to rhetoric of content.
18 History of Greek rhetoric in the period of erudition after Alexander.
19 Historical discussion of the eloquence of the Roman decadence.
20 The revival of preaching in England in the sixteenth century.
21 The rise of non-conformist preaching and its influence.
22 The criticisms and defences of preaching 1650-1700.
23 The history of patriotic oratory.
24 The rise of extempore preaching.
25 The relation of ancient rhetorical theories to the rhetorical curriculum of the Jesuitical schools.
26 A survey of Roman rhetorical education.
27 Seneca as rhetor and rhetorician.
28 The sophists as teachers of public speaking.
29 Eighteenth century schools of public speaking and debate in England.
30 The place of invention in pedagogy of public speaking.
31 The office of "Public Orator" at the English Universities.
32 Rhetorical theory and training in French education. The same in German education.
33 The pedagogy of the eulogistic address.
34 How should public speaking be taught as a preparation for forensic oratory?
35 What ancient judicial rhetoric teaches us for the pedagogy of debate today.
36 The teaching of gesture.
37 The relation of quack methods and short cuts to the academic teaching of public speaking.
38 The education of the orator—investigation of the reading of

typical orators who were consciously preparing themselves for public discourse, such as Burke, Webster, Roosevelt, Gladstone.

39 The rhetorical training of early American statesmen.

40 Translation and editing of the *Rhetoricaad Alexandrum.*

41 Translation or summary of the *Ecclesiastes* of Erasmus.

42 An edition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* condensed, with familiar illustrations and examples, and with notes relating it to modern teaching.

43 Translation, with introduction, comment, and critical notes, of such work as: Navarre's *Essai sur la Rhetorique grecque avant Aristotle;* Chaignet's *La Rhetorique et son Histoire,* Blass' *Attische Beredsamkeit;* Volkman's *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Romer;* Westerman's *Geschichte der Beredsamkeit in Griechenland und Rom.*

44 A collection of the representative speeches from the Greek of the best period (rendered into English).

45 A compilation of the body of literature emanating from the public speaking teachers of antiquity, and of the literature relating to them.

46 A study of Greek judicial oratory.

47 A study of the criticisms and attacks on rhetoric and on public speakers by Plato, Aristotle, Carlyle, Hazlitt, Saint Beuve.

49 Aristotle's *Rhetoric* considered in relation to his *Poetics.*

50 The place of dramatic presentation in the scheme of education, including the great controversies in the English universities.

51 Study of the thesis drama as a form of persuasion.

52 The mixture of rhetorical and poetic theory in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Wilson, Sidney, Puttenham, Ben Jonson).

53 Walt Whitman and the public address of his period.

54 Public speaking as practical and as fine art.

55 The eloquence of genius and that acquired by education.

56 Public speakers and their use of outlines.

57 The rhetoric of those who oppose the use of rhetoric.

58 Asianism and atticism in modern oratory.

59 Studies in the characteristics of certain periods and types; the funeral oration in Rome, in France, in the United States; English parliamentary address; French parliamentary ad-

dress; congressional address in the United States; the lecture as a form of public address (the lyceum movement, British and American); negro eloquence, political discussion in the Scandinavian countries; French eulogy; American eulogy.

60 Rhetorical theory of a definite period.

61 Studies in the theory of certain forms of address; demonstrative; deliberative, forensic, academic; pulpit; economic; inaugural; editorial; nominating; open letter; eulogistic.

62 Collection and editing of sermons from a rhetorical standpoint.

63 Political, economic and religious motivation and influence of sermons.

64 American contributions to homiletic theory.

65 Persuasive plan of apologies for a change in faith; Newman, Manning, Wiseman, A. H. Stephens.

66 A study of the theory of oratory of individuals as revealed in speeches, letters, essays, and supporting historical testimony and descriptions—e. g. Bryan, Wendell Phillips, Webster, Beecher, Phillips Brooks, Henry Clay, Emerson, Bright, Milton, Burke, Sheridan, Gladstone, Disraeli, Jan Smuts, Curzon, Lloyd George, Laurier, Bacon, Danton, Mirabeau, Thier, Parnell, Morley, Puncheon, John Eliot, Pym, William Wirt, Lincoln, Hamilton, Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Fenelon.

67 A rhetorical study of the speeches of certain individuals or of certain corpora, such as: the debates on the federal constitution, the Lincoln-Douglas debates, the Federalist, the discussion of secession, etc.

68 Study (biographical and rhetorical) of the ethical persuasion of selected orators, speakers, and divines.

69 Collection and editing from rhetorical point of view of the speeches of individuals, among others, Eliot, Pym, Bacon, Bismark, Napoleon, Lincoln, Thier.

70 Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Demosthenes' oratory.

71 Oratorical style: theory and examples.

72 The differentia of oral style.

73 English oratorical prose style.

74 Touchstones of eloquence and address (as distinguished from "purple patches").

75 Rhythm in oratorical style.
76 A historical study of the place of rhythm in rhetorical theories.
77 The influence of the style and language of eloquence on English style in general.
78 The influence of modern methods of publicity on the style of oratorical prose.
79 Studies in the oratorical style of selected speakers.
80 The origin and evolution of expression and gesture in man.
81 Aesthetics and delivery.
82 Aristotelian standards of delivery and historical and modern practice and teaching.
83 Early text-books and theories of delivery in England.
84 Mnemonics and public address.
85 Theories of gesture—origin of gesture (gesture and language).
86 How did great speakers actually speak?
87 Delivery in antiquity.
88 Impersonation or interpretation: in acting and formal or informal reading.
89 A theory of dramatic interpretation based on an investigation of the historic treatises and modern tendencies.
90 The paradox of eloquence—as related to the paradox of acting (Diderot).
91 Study of the impulse to communicate: study of orations as a product of: (1) the impulse of a specific orator to a certain kind of expression; (2) the demand of the social mind for a certain kind of communication.
92 The oratorical mind and temperament.
93 Study of the mental processes and preparation of the speaker of a memorized address, the speaker of an extemporaneous address, the reader, the actor; a comparison of these.
94 The subconscious processes of thought and their relation to the preparation of speeches.
95 Relation of opinion to expression.
96 Invention in the light of theories of psychoanalysis.
97 Indirect suggestion and its use in speaking.
98 Humor and its place in persuasion.
99 Aristotle's and modern psychology of the audience.

100 Changing the audience into a psychological crowd—as exemplified in great speeches.
101 Problems of persuasion involved in speaking to various psychological groupings simultaneously.
102 Technique of group thinking in relation to oral discussion and debate.
103 The ethics of crowd formation.
104 The national psychology and the speaker's audience.
105 A historical study of rhetoric and public opinion.
106 Education, national ideals, and persuasion considered as they influence and are influenced by each other.
107 Government control of public opinion as affecting the basis of persuasion.
108 Aristotle and theories of social psychology.
109 Political theories of great orators as shown by an analysis of their speeches.
110 Economic theories of great orators, e. g. John Bright.
111 Aristotle's *Rhetoric* considered in relation to his *Ethics* and *Politics*.
112 The oratory of democracy, of imperialism, of revolution, of religious revival.
113 The oratory of definite periods and movements: Louis XIV, the French revolution, the American revolution, the rise of Puritanism, the southern secession.
114 The theory of eloquence and topics of the orators of a definite period.
115 The comparison of the eloquence of different parts of the country during the same period, e. g. The American frontier and New England.
116 The relation of persuasion to changing social ideals.
117 Studies in the persuasion of agitation: the Lincoln-Douglas debates, Eliot's debates, the anti-slavery, secession, woman suffrage and prohibition movements.
118 Study of the persuasive character of press reports of speeches —and of the effect of press reports on the orator's method of persuasion.
119 Rhetorical theory shown in speeches in novels, drama, poetry.
120 Problems in physical grouping, architectural plan and de-

sign, and auditorium arrangement for types and modes of public discourse and group thinking.

121 Study of voice as related to acoustics.

122 Methods of voice training.

123 Bibliography of the general field. (cf. the Methods and materials of literary criticism. Gayley and Scott, Ginn and Co. 1901).

124 Bibliography of the classical treatises, both in authoritative texts and translations.

125 Bibliography of commentaries on classical treatises and of modern works based on them.

126 Bibliography of modern literature relating to the theory of any branch of public speaking.

127 Bibliography of works in foreign languages.

128 Bibliography of collections, editions, and sources of the texts of speeches.

129 Bibliography of translations of speeches from both classical and modern languages.

THE SPEECH OF THE THEATRE

By WINDSOR P. DAGGETT
New York City

WHAT dialect of English do we hear in the theatre? We are talking about the American stage. Suppose we go back a century and a quarter to the year 1787. In that year William Dunlap, our early American dramatist and producer and the leading historian of the American theatre, was twenty-one years old. That year he marched in a procession that celebrated the signing of the Federal constitution. He marched with a group of young men who were banded together in a philological society. These young men carried a huge book in the procession bearing this inscription: "Federal Language." In the fervor of independence these young Americans were in favor of adopting a new language, an American-made language, a language that would give the back of its hand to English. This "Federal Language" sentiment is persistent. Americans blanch their faces and shout it to-day. It echoed once or twice in the halls of the Seventh Annual Convention of the Teachers of Speech, in December of 1922, New York City.

It is interesting to read Dunlap's own comment on the "Federal Language" legend of 1787. We find it in his *History of the American Theatre* published fifty years later. Dunlap laughs at the inscription "Federal Language." He says in his history, "as if any other than the English language, the language of our fathers, the contemporaries of Hampden and Milton, could be desirable for their sons and the inheritors of their spirit." Dunlap went on to describe the ideals that would shape our drama and make it national, but to him the idea of divorcing American speech from the English language was preposterous.

Fifty years after Dunlap made this comment, and a hundred years after the signing of the Federal Constitution, Mary Anderson, "a direct product of the American stage," was playing Juliet in New York City. I came across some interesting comment on her work. One of her critics in the *Saturday Review* said that Miss Anderson "occasionally lapses into the American language." A

reviewer of this criticism denied that Miss Anderson lapsed into American language, "whatever that is," as he remarked. This defender of Miss Anderson continues to say: "We noticed only one mispronunciation . . . ., but it was not an American mispronunciation; and for my part I must say that, with a tolerably familiar knowledge of almost every American dialect, I was unable to detect any American accent in her voice or intonation." The rest of this reviewer's remark is important: "Both the intonation and the voice do indeed differ unmistakably from those which are common to the English stage. But the difference is not an American difference, and it is moreover, a difference greatly for the better."

We come down to the present day. It would be appropriate at this time to discuss the speech of Ethel Barrymore, who is now playing Juliet forty years after the period of Mary Anderson. But we will take the case of Richard Bennett, our American actor from Logansport, Indiana. About ten years ago, he produced *Damaged Goods,* by Brieux. The introduction to Brieux's play in book form was written by George Bernard Shaw. Bennett was later visiting in London, where he met Shaw. Shaw was interested in phonetics, and someone had tipped him off that Bennett spoke a delicious Indiana dialect if anyone could get him going. Shaw talked to Bennett for some time without discovering any American dialect, and so he tried new tactics. Shaw said to Bennett: "You used my introduction to *Damaged Goods* to advertise your play and you never paid me a penny. Is that the way you Americans do business?" This mention of a royalty made Bennett angry. He flew off the handle. He was soon red in the face and he was talking the Indiana dialect of his boyhood to the great delight of the author of *Back to Methuselah.* "That's all right," said Shaw. "I didn't mean anything. Ever since you came, I've been trying to hear you talk your American dialect. Now I've heard it." "So, that's what you wanted," retorted Bennett. "Well, I'll have you know that before I went onto the New York stage, I had to forget that Indiana dialect and learn the English language."

That was the situation in the time of Dunlap, in the time of Mary Anderson, and it is the situation to-day. The thinking actor and the thinking part of his audience are entirely agreed that the language of the American theatre in high comedy is the English language.

To come back to Mary Anderson. What did the reviewer mean when he said that her speech was different from the common speech of the British stage, but that the difference was not an American difference? He meant simply this that Mary Anderson was speaking standard English. She was not speaking a regional American dialect. She was not speaking a regional British dialect. She was speaking a form of English that is free from local influence. And as this reviewer said, it was an improvement over the common dialect of the London stage. The first fact to emphasize about the speech of the theatre is this; in it is best circles, the dialect of the theatre is Standard English. This dialect is a world English that does not belong to any particular class of society or to any particular region or government. Of course, some of the common regional dialects creep into the theatre. But even in the cosmopolitan city of New York these dialects are immediately detected. They are hurtful to the play and to the prestige of the actor. His regional dialect is his confession to the audience that he has not gone through the process of preparing for the cultured speech of a national theatre.

Webster's Dictionary often refers to pronunciations that are "especially British." All of these pronunciations may be heard in the speech of American actors. Professor Grandgent of Harvard in his essays on American pronunciation says that the cultured speech of America has always shown British influence. I have found this so true in the theatre that I feel that the case ought to be stated differently. My way of putting it is this, and the rules apply from the time of Dunlap to the present day: The standard of pronunciation that gives the British actor and the American actor pretty nearly a common standard of pronunciation is simply the kept-together pronunciation. The manifold dialects of our country that vary from the cultured usage of educated speakers of the present day are simply the strayed-away pronunciations. The kept-together pronunciations have always been heard on the stage and in the educated speech of society.

This does not make us out to be impoverished imitators. It rather indicates that our alertness of mind has made us citizens of the world and saved us from provincialism. The strayed-away pronunciations represent what is typical of American soil. They represent the history of the prairie schooner and the pioneer. They

take us back to the foot-stove and farmer-preacher, and to the self-made man of American democracy. These dialects of the soil, historically made, are as varied as our early struggles and as multiform as the influences that shaped them. They were "territorial" from the start. They are national only in theory, for they are still regional in habit. The dialect of the soil is American, but never in history did it represent the cultured speech of America in its highest form. That is a different matter. The inevitable influence of commerce and radio is to make the cultured speech of America, not more insular than it was in 1787, but more than ever the kept-together dialect of a world language. Fact one: The educated speech of the theatre is Standard English.

Fact two: The stage gives ample room to American dialects of every brand and description, just as the London stage gives ample room for every dialect of little England and the British Empire. The only thing that the critical judgment asks for is that the dialect comes at the right time and in the right place. We do not wish to hear "laff" for "laugh" in Shakespeare or "gahd" for "God" in supposedly cultured speech.

Educated people go to the theatre. A more critical faculty on the part of the audience is operating to demand "character" dialects, as they are called, that are true to the soil. The stage Yankee, the stage Frenchman, and the stage dude, always "English," have all been discarded. Some of the effort to be true to life is superficial, but generally it is encouraging and satisfactory. In "Main Street," Stuart Walker employed an actress who has spent all her life in the Middle West to play the part of Maud Dyer. In "The Wren" by Booth Tarkington, the setting was the coast of Maine. The part of Sam was played by an actor-farmer who is a native and resident of the state. The character woman in the play is a very careful student of dialects. Helen Hays, who played the leading part, comes from Virginia, but her pronunciation is more Eastern than it is Southern. In preparation for the play she made a trip to Maine to get local color. In "The Hero" the locality of the play was western New York. The company went into consultation on the dialect of the play and they were fairly uniform in the detail of their work. Frank Bacon in "Lightnin'" was particularly watchful to see that members of his company kept Eastern dialect out of his Western play, and I may say that Mr. Bacon's habits

of speech in his dressing room were very different from his dialect on the stage. Mr. Bacon liked to talk to Ethel Barrymore and he admired her voice. When he talked to Ethel Barrymore, you may depend upon it that Mr. Bacon's pronunciation matched Miss Barrymore's in standard usage.

When it comes to elocution there is pretty nearly everything in the American theatre to discourage the actor from studying. The mechanical school of elocution and gesture became absurd. The very term "elocution" became a byword and it remains a byword in the theatre. Everything in our generation has been naturalness. Shakespeare, romantic drama, melodrama, all went out of fashion. A modern treatment of everyday life became the theme of the dramatist, and everyday manner became the fashion of the actor. "Be natural, be yourself" has been the constant cry of the director. With this demand for naturalness the study of voice and speech went out of fashion. The actor was afraid of losing himself, losing his "personality" as he calls it, if he trusted his training to a teacher. The director would never urge the actor to seek a teacher, fearing again self-consciousness and artificiality. Furthermore, where is the actor to go for instruction?[2] The elocution teacher will be "elocutionary." The teacher of singing-voice will know next to nothing about speech. Other reasons why study went out of fashion are that the "type" actor of to-day, the actor selected because he looks the part or is the part in a certain way,—this actor is likely to succeed on personality unimproved. Another reason is that there is a good deal of easy money in the American theatre. An actress becomes a star because of her ankle or gowns. She draws $400 a week without owning a dictionary. She naturally laughs at the actress on $50 a week who spends a tenth of her income on self-improvement. This general emphasis on "personality" and big salary and press agent notoriety is a great detriment to study. There are many earnest men and women in the theatre who would devote themselves to study if they were not deliberately scoffed at by their easy-money colleagues. The result is that there are very few good voices on the stage, and most of the good voices are natural voices. There are notable exceptions. There are men and women who quietly and regularly apply themselves to study; but they are an inner circle. A year ago, Mr. E. H. Southern offered to pay for the instruction if some of the younger

members of his company would improve their voices and their knowledge of speech during the summer; but the young actors were not interested.

In the speech of the theatre, we must deal with a double process, voice and diction, just as separately as we deal with a double process in singing. Words without voice are just as unsatisfactory and incomplete in spoken drama, as voice without words is unsatisfactory in song. Julia Marlowe always had voice and words, and she must not be forgotten in this connection. There is no one else to-day with her ear for tone and her discipline in the music of speech.

The problem of voice both in song and speech is a serious problem. Read any book on singing and you will see the discouragement of teachers and critics who have studied this subject most thoroughly.The mechanical school of voice production that has been in vogue for fifty or a hundred years has lost the secret of nature's method. I heard a beautiful singing voice last winter, and so I went to Sam Ash and asked him if he had developed his voice under a teacher. "No," was his answer, "I have been fortunate in not getting stung. Some teachers I have met would ruin a voice." Then he went on to say that he had been helped by certain teachers, and by one in particular. This teacher had showed him how to keep his natural voice and not how to "make" it. The same is true of Walter Woolf, now singing in "The Lady in Ermine." Mr. Woolf sang so well this year that I thought he had studied abroad in recent months. That was not the case. Mr. Woolf has a natural voice. He sang three years on the stage with comparatively little vocal training.Now he has a teacher, who is enabling him to keep his natural voice and to use it in dramatic roles that require technique.

If the singer can do so well on his natural voice, the speaker can get by on his. Many actors who try singing to aid the speech find that they lose their range and their natural quality. This should not be the case, but such is the lottery of instruction.

The worst fault in the theatre is forcing the tone by the muscles of the throat. This is so familiar that it needs no discussion. But if you will watch John Barrymore play "Hamlet" you will notice that he avoids this fault with technical skill. With a fundamentally

bad voice to work with, Mr. Barrymore has brought to "Hamlet" a voice of artistic discipline and understanding. This has meant study.

One can sit in the theatre and discover all the schools of technique. There is the school of "breathing." An actress came to me and said: "I can't swallow when I speak. I can't even swallow the saliva in my mouth. I am acutally ashamed the way I sprinkle the actors near me." As I became acquainted with this woman, I found that she had learned all this from a teacher. She had paid money to learn how to sprinkle. She thought breath was so important that she blew up to the bursting point every time she started to speak. Dr. Mariofioti, who has written a book on Caruso's voice, was speaking of this the other day. He said that too much breath is destructive of resonance. And yet he said we see singers who sing "with everything they've got." The other day a young actor came to me all worn out from rehearsals. He was about to open in a new play and wanted first aid. I asked if he had a rhythmic action at the diaphragm. He said "Oh yes. That is the first thing I learned. Everything from down here." He was working like a dago 'down here,' but all to no purpose. He was taking a big chest breath, tightening his throat, and then pumping like a fire engine.

There is the actor who thinks that tone is an open throat. He gets tone by unshakling his jaw and mouth when he speaks. There is that beautiful thing called resonance, which often means head resonance and in some cases nasality. This actor says, "Oh, yes, I can be heard. That's what they always say of my voice, I can be heard anywhere." But there is no beauty in this tone, and it is often superficial. Considering that an actor uses his voice continually he does succeed most of the time in getting his tone into the mouth.

What is noticeably lacking in the theatre is getting the tone forward, where it can be molded into speech. Articulation is very largely a matter of consonants, and the greater number of our consonants are made in front of the mouth, with the lips, teeth, and the front of the tongue. It is quite rare to find a voice that is free from constrictions in the throat, that has the indirect resonance in the chest and head, and that sends its main stream of breath

flowing smoothly to the lips, where it is articulated into speech, with ease and beauty. When this is accomplished, we have good voice and good diction. There is no reminder of a breathing process; there is no reminder of nasality or head tone. The voice flows like music, and the speech falls off the tongue without being mouthed or smacked.

One very definite fault in the theatre is the glottal stop. Practically speaking, one may say that there should never be a glottal stop in speaking, and yet there are women who pinch through their speeches making close ee-sounds and i-sounds. They never have a stress word beginning with a vowel, unless they gave the vocal cords an 'iking' sound by forcing breath through a closed glottis. Another fault is "foreigner's English." We get this from certain old actors of formal style, who sound every syllable. "They pro-nounce syl-la-bi-cal-ly, with each vow-el on a plat-ter." We also get this from some of the young girls from the New York public schools from the Jersey side who come from a common environment and associate cultured speech with a spelling pronunciation. The unfortunate thing is that it is mostly Americans who speak foreigner's English.

Our schools have known nothing about the weak forms in connected speech. To weaken a vowel sound in an unstressed syllable, is assumed to be vulgar. "Dictionary" and "library" must have secondary stresses at all costs and "the cat" must be "thee cat," with no weakening of the recurrent article. The ignorance of Americans generally on the history of spoken English as distinct from written English is deplorable.

The New York theatre draws its recruits from everywhere: from London, Dublin, Edinburgh, from Australia, Texas, Georgia. These actors from everywhere, imperfect as their speech may be, go through a process of elimination and shaping, before they are even passable in the presence of a critical audience. The speech of the theatre is still "mixed," but it is not so mixed as the speech of our American teachers and school children. The American actor is criticised for his speech more than the American college professor. Even when the actor is deficient in formal education, he is often highly sensitive in ear, and he learns by unconscious imitation. As a method of instruction, Phonetics is taking the place of "elocution." Phonetics is based on accurate observations

and historical fact. It comes from men of learning. It delivers us from false manners and the hoodoo of spelling. It enables us "to know a hawk from a handsaw" and the sounds of our tongue from a book of words.

PHONETICS TRAINING FOR CHILDREN—A FUNCTION OF THE NORMAL SCHOOL

SOPHIE A. PRAY
New York City

PHONETICS, the art, is the basis of systematic and early speech training. Voice production, elocution, etc., are merely different applications of phonetics. William Tilly differentiates phonetics the *Art* from phonetics the science as follows: "Phonetics as a science simply determines the facts of provincial and class dialects; it is not interested in right or wrong, all are of equal value. Phonetics the *Art* is concerned with teaching certain of these facts with some distinct object in view:

1. Language is a means of communication. We teach the form best suited to that purpose. We avoid provincialisms, local dialects.

2. Language indicates social standing. We teach the form which gives the impression that the speaker belongs to the cultured class. We avoid vulgarisms, low class dialects."

It is the province of the schools to give to their pupils a form of speech that is recognized as good all over the English speaking world. How can this be done unless the teachers themselves are taught "Standard English" in the Normal Schools, and trained to pass on their information to the children? At the present time at least five different dialects are spoken by the teachers of our city schools. For example, I have heard "Class—Stand!" pronounced five different ways; "bird" three different ways; and "not" six different ways.

Children are being taught to come to a full stop before another consonant in the same breath group. In fact the majority of teachers do not seem to realize that our speech is divided into breath groups, and that the division into words is merely for the eye, and that there are no pauses between the separate words.

The proper pronunciation of weak syllables and the use of the "weak" forms of conjunctions, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, etc., is almost unknown in the elementary schools. Indeed the poor youngsters try so hard to bring out every word that the principle of English emphasis is violated and level emphasis is the result. In the "Report of a Conference on Speech Training in London schools and training colleges" published by the London County Council in March 1916, it states under the head of "Unnecessary Corrections" that it is "important not to insist on a precise pronunciation of vowels in unstressed syllables. Much time is at present wasted in elementary schools in teaching children to pronounce the second syllables of *mountain, sailor, broken, wanted,* so as to rhyme with *pain, or, pen, bed;* and to pronounce the first syllables of *expect, remember, consider,* with the same vowel sound as *decks, tree, on.*

Likewise we consider it undesirable to insist on the use of the strong forms of such words as *was, and, of, from, can, for, him, his, her,* in unimportant positions. In fact we think it would be well that children should be instructed in the proper use of the strong and weak forms of such words." Besides giving a foreign sound to the speech, the use of "strong" forms instead of "weak" often makes the meaning obscure.

The almost universal habit (in this country) of calling sounds by the English names of the letters, is most confusing to children. They should be taught to distinguish between the written and the spoken language. The present method of trying to make an orthography which represents roughly the pronunciation of about 500 years ago, the basis of teaching our present pronunciation, which is radically different, is largely responsible for the confused ideas and poor speech of our schools.

That all the foregoing is taking place is not the fault of the teachers but it is due to their training. The remedy must be sought in the Normal School. Speech Training must be given for at least an hour weekly during the entire Normal School course. The report on "The Teaching of English in England" states that "The first chief duty of the Elementary school is to give its pupils speech —to make them articulate and civilized human beings, able to communicate themselves in speech and writing and able to receive the communication of others. It must be remembered that children

until they can readily receive such communication are entirely cut off from the life and thought and experience of the race embodied in human words." "Speech training must be undertaken from the outset and should be continued all through the period of schooling." "It is emphatically the business of the Elementary school to teach all its pupils who either speak a definite dialect, or whose speech is disfigured by vulgarisms to speak Standard English and to speak it clearly and with expresssion. It is not sufficient merely to correct the various errors of pronunciation as they occur, or to insist on the children 'speaking out.' They should learn to recognize every sound in Standard English, should observe for themselves how sounds are produced and modified by the position of the speech organs and should practice producing them properly."

It is the function of the Normal School to train its students so that they will be competent to handle the speech problems of our schools in a systematic way. Because of the large percentage of foreign pupils in the schools of our large cities it is essential that the teachers have a knowledge not only of English sounds, but also of the foreign sounds that are often substituted for them even in the speech of some of our teachers. In order to handle the speech problems satisfactorily the teacher must have some mode of symbolizing the sounds taught, based strictly on the principle, "one sound, one symbol." In the isolated instances where the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association has been used to indicate pronunciation, remarkable improvement has been shown by the pupils. The initial difficulty of learning the symbols is felt *only* by the *teachers,* and *not* by the *pupils.*

In my courses in Phonetics I find that the children experience no difficulty whatever in learning the symbols and in producing the sounds they represent. The training school girls learn these symbols readily; the young teachers learn the symbols with some difficulty; but the older teachers, with a few exceptions, say that they find it almost impossible to learn the symbols. Manifestly, then, the place to begin the training is in the *kindergarten,* and the normal school pupils must be taught how to give this training. We have begun this work in one of the kindergartens in this city with very gratifying results, and I understand that Mrs. Blanton has worked the matter out more in detail in Madison, Wisconsin.

In order that the normal school students may obtain the proper instruction in Phonetics and Speech Training it is necessary for their teachers to have a more thorough knowledge of Phonetics than is required at present. They should be required to possess a certificate of proficiency in Phonetics obtained by passing an examination before the councillors of the Interantional Phonetic Association, or phoneticians of equal international reputation.

THE FIELD OF RHETORIC*

HOYT H. HUDSON
Cornell University

WHEN Bishop Whately published his *Elements of Rhetoric,* he confessed in his preface that he had hesitated to use the word "rhetoric" in his title, because, he said, it is "apt to suggest to many minds an associated idea of empty declamation, or of dishonest artifice; or at best, a mere dissertation on Tropes and Figures of speech." We can appreciate the good bishop's hesitancy. For "rhetoric" is one of those words which has been so unfortunate as to lose most of its good connections and to be known by the bad company it has sometimes kept. There are five or six meanings given for "rhetoric" in the dictionary; but we are prone to think of only one, and that is "artificial elegance of language, or declamation without conviction or earnest feeling." Thus we are likely to speak of certain pieces of writing or speaking as "mere rhetoric;" or of a writer or speaker as "indulging in meaningless displays of rhetoric." It suggests an inflation of style to cover weakness of thought or, in our American phrasing, something spread-eagle or highfaluting—and, as I have suggested, only for display.

Yet some respectable connotations have managed to cling to "rhetoric" through the centuries. Walking along a city street not long ago, I passed a building marked "School of Expression," with a sort of menu-card posted by the door showing the subjects that were taught in this school. Very lowest on the list, which included two or three kinds of dancing, elocution, dramatics, public speaking, and oratory, there was offered "rhetoric." I was reminded of Charles Lamb's answer to the saying that a pun is the lowest form of wit: it is the lowest, Lamb insists, only because it is the foundation of all. And if this school of expression had included in its list courses in salesmanship and personal efficiency, as do some similar schools, it would be very much like the schools of the sophists

in ancient Athens, wherein rhetoric was the foundation for a training in all the accomplishments and graces necessary to business and social success.

We are more familiar with the word "rhetoric" in the titles of textbooks on writing, of which many published within the past two or three decades have been named "Composition and Rhetoric;" though I am tempted to believe that if you asked the authors of some of these books to tell you which pages were composition and which were rhetoric, they would be at a loss. Some books named "Rhetoric" alone strikingly resemble others named "Composition and Rhetoric" or still others named "Composition" alone. Yet careful writers have maintained a distinction here, one which will throw light on what I have to say a little later about rhetoric in ancient times. Turning to one of the best secondary school texts I know of, Clippinger's "Composition and Rhetoric," I find these sentences:

> Rhetoric and composition are not always distinguished, because they are usually studied together; however the difference between them should be understood. Composition *produces* discourse; rhetoric *analyzes* discourse to determine its structure.

In other words, speaking roughly, a distinction is here being made between the pure science (rhetoric) and the applied science (composition); or, if we prefer, between the science of discourse (rhetoric) and the art of discourse (composition). A product of composition might be an essay; a product of rhetoric, in this sense, would be an outline or analysis of an essay, perhaps with a list of forms of arrangement and figures of speech employed in it. A similar distinction must have been in the minds of those who used to teach rhetoric and oratory; rhetoric was the theory, oratory was the practice. And yet there have been some, and the author of the definition in the New International Dictionary is among them, who have overlooked this distinction and have made rhetoric mean "the art of discourse"—the theory and the practice. It is all very confusing; and I trust you are ready to turn back, with me, to another meaning of the word "rhetoric," one which, with whatever incrustations of additional meanings it may have gathered, the word has held for some students and writers and speakers in every generation for nearly twenty-five centuries.

Wherever we approach the subject of rhetoric, or the subject of oratory or eloquence, we do not go far without meeting finger-

posts that point us to the work of Aristotle. Welldon, the translator of Aristotle, refers to his *Rhetoric* as being "perhaps the solitary instance of a book which not only begins a science, but completes it." Welldon says a little too much. A better statement is that of Hugh Blair, the Scottish preacher whose lectures on rhetoric formed the standard text-book both in England and America for fifty years. Blair wrote in 1759:

> Aristotle laid the foundation for all that was afterwards written on the subject. That amazing and comprehensive genius . . . has investigated the principles of rhetoric with great penetration. Aristotle appears to have been the first who took rhetoric out of the hands of the sophists, and introduced reasoning and good sense into the art. Some of the profoundest things that have been written on the passions and manners of men, are to be found in his Treatise on Rhetoric.

Sears includes in his *History of Oratory* a chapter on "Aristotle, the Rhetorician," from which I shall quote two sentences:

> He must be recognized as the father of rhetorical science, and as the man who in an age of orators compassed the whole scale of their practice. It has been observed that in the most perfect example of persuasive oratory on record—the creation of the greatest genius among the English-speaking race—Shakespeare's speech of Mark Antony—the rationale of it all had been set forth by the great Greek scientist eighteen centuries before.

In Henry Peacham's *Compleat Gentleman*, a popular work on polite accomplishments which was first published in 1622, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is said to have been deemed by some as "being sufficient . . . to make both a Scholler and an honest man." The study of rhetoric, it is needless to say, has not always been credited with such effects.

At any rate, we do well to begin with Aristotle in building up our concept of rhetoric. With him rhetoric is a useful art, the art of persuasion, based upon a pure science. It is a useful art, because it supplements rather than imitates nature; it supplements nature, in that it helps truth and justice maintain their natural superiority. In his book Aristotle begins with the subject as a science, for he defines rhetoric not as the art of persuasion, but as "the faculty of finding, in any subject, all the available means of persuasion." That is, he makes the rhetorician a sort of diagnostician and leaves it to others to be the practitioners; the rhetorician is the strategist of persuasion, and other men execute his plans and

do the fighting. In practice, however, and in any study of the subject, this distinction can hardly be maintained, since the person who determines the available means of persuasion in regard to a given subject must also be, in most cases, the one to apply those means in persuasive speech and writing. In passing I might suggest, however, that if anywhere, either in the profession of law or in advertising or in any sort of publicity work, you know a person who spends his time in analyzing subjects given him and deciding how they can best be presented, what appeals can be based upon them, yet who does not himself present the subjects or make the appeals, there you come near to having the pure rhetorician, in the narrow Aristotelian sense.

But in ancient as in modern times (as we have noted in the case of "Composition and Rhetoric") it was found impossible to divorce theory from practice. The rhetorician and the orator were one; and if not in Aristotle himself, at least in the Aristotelian school and tradition, rhetoric is the whole art of persuasion. It does not satisfy itself alone with the finding of means of persuasion; it also includes the persuasive arrangement and presentation of the speaker's material. A product of rhetoric, in this sense, then, is neither an analysis of some speech already made, with a list of figures and tropes, nor an analysis of a subject upon which a speech is to be made, showing what means of persuasion can be employed. Rather it is a speech, or some piece of persuasive discourse, persuasively presented.

I know of no statement of this meaning more simple than the earliest one to be found in any English publication: it is taken from Caxton's translation of *The Mirrour of the World*, published by himself in 1481. Caxton worded it thus: "Rhethoryke is a scyence to cause another man by speche or by wrytynge to beleue or to do that thynge whyche thou woldest haue hym for to do." This identification of rhetoric with persuasion is frequently met with in English literature throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Thus Samuel Daniel has a line,

> Sweet, silent rhetoric of persuading eyes.

Nowadays we have a proverb, "Money talks," meaning usually, "Money is the most powerful means of persuasion." A seventeenth century writer of epigrams wrote a couplet embodying the

same idea; he called his epigram, "New Rhetorique," and it runs,

> Good arguments without coyn, will not stick;
> To pay and not to say's best Rhetorick.

Obviously, such an epigram would be understandable only among readers who were accustomed to think of rhetoric as persuasion. In this sense, plainly, the man who speaks most persuasively uses the most, or certainly the best, rhetoric; and the man whom we censure for inflation of style and strained effects is suffering not from too much rhetoric, but from a lack of it.

Let us proceed with this meaning in mind. We recognize that in ancient times persuasion was carried on almost entirely by the spoken word. We know the great place held by public speaking in Greece and Rome, at least in their democratic phases. We know also of the place of preaching in the early church: "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" asks St. Paul. "And how shall they hear without a preacher?" After the invention of the printing-press we find persuasion carried on more and more by writing, through the pamphlet and the journal, until in our own day if we run over the principal manifestations of the persuasive art we find as many of them in type as in the spoken word. Editorial writing, pamphleteering, the immense business of advertising and the still more immense business of propaganda,—these are occupations which modern rhetoricians may follow. Yet there are also open to them the occupations calling for public speech, those of preaching, of law, of politics, the lecture and chautauqua platform, business and culture clubs. In commerce, corresponding to advertising, there is the great field of salesmanship, carried on for the most part by speaking. We expect of our publicist that he shall both write and speak.

Yet in spite of our habit of thinking of writing and speaking as separate processes, the practice of persuasion is essentially one, in that the same principles apply everywhere in the field. A writer on public speaking at the present time would hesitate to call his work "Rhetoric," because the word is now usually applied to written discourse. But less than a hundred years ago the case was exactly reversed. Bishop Whately, in the preface already cited, gives as another reason against the use of the title, "Rhetoric," that "it is rather the more commonly employed with reference to public speaking alone." E. L. Godkin, the great American editor, wrote

a half-century ago: "the art of rhetoric differs from some others in having arrived long ago at perfection. The rules are the same today as they were in the days of Quintilian and Demosthenes. The art, however, has now two distinct branches, writing and oratory." Only last year a writer in "The Nation," reviewing Donelly's *The Art of Interesting*, said: The author "is a sound classical scholar. He has done us the service of showing conclusively that the underlying principles of classical rhetoric are fundamentally valid today—that Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian knew not only how to make speeches, but how to preach sermons, write editorials, and sell groceries."

Then, too, in spite of the great bulk of printed material in the modern world, public speaking and eloquence have by no means lost their potency; and to consider the subject of persuasion apart from speech would be indeed to play Hamlet with the prince left out. The printed word can be passed by or laid aside; the persuasive speaker wins willing and continuous attention. "What is read is accepted inertly, or, if questioned for authenticity, affords no easy measures for resolving doubt. When man listens to speaking, however, he has a definite guide for his reaction: he can look the speaker in the eye, study his face, watch his actions and bearing, analyze his voice, penetrate into the man himself, and then know whether or not he finds him worthy of credence. This is the reason why, when men really care, when an issue is deeply at stake, when the crisis impends, they resort not so much to the writer as to the speaker."* We may say further that speaking is still the *norm* of writing; the writer tests his article by reading it aloud "to see how it sounds," and the would-be persuasive writer can do no better than to write as a good speaker would speak.

We might now glance over the field historically, with a view to estimating the body of tradition which has grown up in the study of rhetoric. Greek rhetoric is a large field in itself, too large to be plotted here. Besides Aristotle the other great master of rhetorical theory in Greece was Isocrates, a successful teacher, who gave to his work a more immediately practical turn than Aristotle; the pupils of Isocrates were the great orators, generals, and statesmen of their time. It seems that Isocrates not only taught

* Woolbert's *Fundamentals of Speech*, pp. 1–2.

the form and means of persuasion, but also offered a certain content or body of doctrine which was to provide the subject-matter of his pupils' persuasive efforts. I suppose that when, at the present time, we combine work in Americanization or studies in patriotism with Public Speaking, preparing students to speak on principles or Americanism, we are doing somewhat as Isocrates did in his time. In Rome, Cicero and Quintilian are the great names, though by no means the only ones.* St. Augustine was a teacher of rhetoric, and it was as a connoisseur going to hear a great artist that Augustine went to listen to the preaching of St. Ambrose, whose persuasion led to his conversion. Rhetoric was one of the seven liberal arts of the mediaeval curriculum—and in that statement we are summing up many centuries of rhetorical pedagogy and practice, with some changes which we shall note later. Among the Humanists we find Melancthon writing a treatise on rhetoric, while Erasmus wrote widely in rhetorical subjects; the *De Copia Verborum* of Erasmus was used as a school text in rhetoric for many years. Coxe and Wilson, two of the English Humanists, wrote the first works on rhetoric in our language.

It is interesting to find how many men who became eminent for other reasons made, at some time in their lives, researches in the field of rhetoric. Sir Francis Bacon tried to recall scholars in his day to the classical view of the subject, and also found time, in the midst of his other pursuits, to become a great speaker,— in the opinion of Ben Jonson the best speaker of his generation. One of the works of Thomas Hobbes is an abridgement of the Rhetoric of Aristotle, with an appended treatise of his own on the same subject. Isaac Barrow, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University and Head of Trinity College, who was famous both as a preacher and as a mathematician second only to Newton in Newton's time, was in his early days a teacher of rhetoric and gave a year's lectures on the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle. Adam Smith, author of *The Wealth of Nations*, lectured on rhetoric for several years. John Quincy Adams was the first to hold the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard, and his lectures form one of the principal American con-

* Readers of Professor Shorey's article in the April, 1922, number of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL already have a better view of rhetoric in the classical period than I can hope to suggest here.

tributions to the tradition of the subject. Bishop Whately, great as a logician, and Alexander Bain, great as a psychologist, were the principal British writers on rhetoric in the nineteenth century.

But in addition to writers on the theory of rhetoric, the student of the subject must take into his account the practitioners,—the men who have gone to the rostrum or the senate-house, to the pulpit or the hustings, and have attempted to influence men by persuasive speech. The names of the great orators comprise too long a list to be enumerated here. It should be noted, however, that the student of rhetoric investigates eloquence, not for its graces and ornaments, and not with regard to its effect upon him as he reads it; our admiration may be excited by a splendid figure in Burke or Canning; we may gain considerable pleasure from perceiving the skill with which words have been joined euphoniously and rythmically,—but such admiration and pleasure are incidental and are shared by the student of literature or the general reader. The student of rhetoric looks upon each oration as an effort in persuasion; he must learn what he can of the audience to which it was addressed; he takes note of the appeals that are made, with reference to the motives that are touched, the emotions that are aroused. He must know the character and reputation of the speaker at the time when the speech was made; for a speech otherwise persuasive may fail of effect because the speaker lacks a persuasive *ethos;* whereas at times one sentence from a man of great ethical weight is sufficient to perform a difficult task of persuasion. It is true that we must also take into account matters of style and ornament and delivery; but these, too, are to be estimated with reference to their persuasive effect. Figures and tropes, neat turns of speech and well-drawn pictures, are used to feather the arrow of argument and appeal; but they can also impede its flight.

It is true that there are passages in oratory where the orator seems to throw off the bonds of rhetoric as a useful art and to enter the realm of the fine arts. The end of persuasion is for the moment forgotten in sheer delight at beauty of conception and expression. It is as if a stone-cutter, carving out a figure for some public building, should be touched by inspiration and become a sculptor, making of his figure a statue worthy of standing alone, and more important as art than the whole of the building. Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith, whose work as an anthologist of beautiful passages of prose is well

known, says in the introduction to his volume of *Selected Passages from Donne's Sermons:*

> It is in the sermon, therefore, that we find some of the highest achievements of English prose—in the sermon, or in prophetic or didactic or even political eloquence written with the same high impulse and inspiration. For great prose needs a great subject-matter, needs great themes and a high spectacular point of vision, and solemn and clear and steadfast conception of life and its meaning.

Such passages we can share with the student of literature, asking him, however, to acknowledge the credit due to the rhetorical discipline and practice which brought the orator to such a measure of perfection, and also taking into account the persuasive task which provided the occasion.

For the most part the student of rhetoric is dealing with broader effects. Goldwin Smith speaks of John Pym as the "first great wielder of public opinion in England." It is the *wielder of public opinion* that the student of rhetoric is interested in. What are the secrets of his power? The rhetorical element in statesmanship is a whole field of study in itself. How many a good policy has been beaten or postponed for want of proper presentation! How many a just and able man has suffered because of an unpersuasive announcement of his purposes! The defeat of Blaine in 1884 is laid, as we know, at the door of his campaigner who untactfully launched against the Democrats the charge of "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion" phrased with such perverse effectiveness. I shall not enlarge upon the wielding of public opinion which was carried on by Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson in our own time, by means of their powers of presentation. Enough if I have suggested that in political life a man must be something other than a pure statesman on the one hand or a literary artist on the other; he must know and use rhetoric as a technique of power.

In our own time also we have seen a unique example of the wielding of power through propaganda in the case of the Russian revolution. I recall from John Reed's *Ten Days that Shook the World* a story of how in the first days of the Bolshevik revolution, when the forces of Kerensky were within a few miles of Petrograd and threatening to retake the city, a courier from the battle-line came in haste to the city for aid. "Do you want more soldiers?" he was asked. "No, we want orators!" he said. And a truck-load of orators was mobilized and hurried to the scene of conflict.

Many have wondered how the Bolsheviki, representing the opinion of only a small fraction of the Russian people, have been able to hold power, conduct military operations, and even extend their sovereignty over new territory. Their use of rhetoric as a technique of power helps answer the question. General C. Birdwood-Thompson of the English Army, writing in the *Manchester Guardian,* relates a conversation held with Trotzky, in which General Thompson asked about the "new form of war" carried on by Russia, in which the territory to be conquered was "leavened by political agents" and then easily occupied by a small military force. He goes on:

> Trotzky's reply was curious. He said: "War by propaganda is not the invention of a Russian, but rather of an Englishman." And then by way of explanation he added: "Do you remember the story of Oliver Cromwell, who refused to punish one of his subordinates 'because,' he said, 'this man is a good preacher?'"

Some question is sure to arise concerning the relation of rhetoric, in our sense, to other fields of study. It is undeniable that rhetoric draws on other fields with considerable disregard for the airtight partitions sometimes put up between college departments. A student of architecture, whose aim is to learn to design buildings, cannot study that subject alone. Without becoming an engineer, he must draw on the special field of engineering for a knowledge of materials and construction. Without becoming a painter or sculptor he must know free-hand drawing, color, and relief. He does well to learn something of surveying and landscape gardening. If he expects not only to design buildings but also to superintend their construction, there are a great many other subjects he must know; yet at the end of it all, he is an architect. The case with the rhetorician is analogous. He must learn much from the psychologist, especially with regard to the subjects of attention and emotion. From the social psychologist he draws what knowledge he can of the crowd-mind and the formation of public opinion. There are certain fundamental problems of society which a publicist is continually going to deal with, usually in relation to political questions. Aristotle, in discussing deliberative rhetoric, says that the subjects embraced are finance, war and peace, defence of the country, imports and exports, and legislation. Yet the rhetorician does not necessarily become an expert in those fields. He attempts to learn the authorities and sources of information in each,

and to develop a method which he can apply to specific problems as they arise. He learns, in any given situation, what questions to ask—and to answer. The peculiar contribution of the rhetorician is the discovery and use, to the common good, of those things which move men to action—intangible, obscure, mystic, even, as these things may be; yet you and I and our communities find them intertwined with every problem of life.

The question of the relation of rhetoric to the work of the department of English is too involved for me to attempt an answer. From what we have already seen of the field of rhetoric, however, I think one or two suggestions might be drawn. The work of departments of English is already very broad, ranging from courses in Old English and Middle-English to those in short-story writing, dramatic structure, biographical studies of authors, and historical studies of literary tendencies. If the department of English absorbs, in addition, the work in rhetoric, at least it should do so with complete knowledge of the breadth and importance of it, and aware of the distinction between rhetoric and other forms of literature. So far as English is the study of language, philology, it is not very closely related to rhetoric; so far as it is a study of literature it deals with a fine art; whereas we have seen that rhetoric is to be classed with the useful arts. Aristotle intended his *Poetics* to treat of discourse designed to delight; he wrote his *Rhetoric* to treat of discourse designed to persuade. We can cite John Milton as a man great in both fields. The student of literature will be especially interested in Milton's poetry. To the student of rhetoric, however, the most important part of Milton's life is the twenty years when, after having written "Lycidas" and "Comus" and other poems, he turned to writing controversial prose for the influencing of public opinion.

The writer in pure literature has his eye on his subject; his subject has filled his mind and engaged his interest, and he must tell about it; his task is expression; his form and style are organic with his subject. The writer of rhetorical discourse has his eye upon the audience and occasion; his task is persuasion; his form and style are organic with the occasion. As for showing this distinction in our curricula, might it not be possible to put all study of exposition and argumentation into a course or group of courses together with other work in rhetoric and public speaking; while the teaching of narration and description, or of such literary forms

as the short-story, the familiar essay, and the play, might be kept in closer relation to the courses in literature and in distinction from the forms of writing and speaking as a useful art. There is surely a closer kinship between writing a piece of argumentation and the delivery of an argumentative speech than between the writing of the same piece of argumentation and the reading of Tennyson's poems. Surely it is not asking too much to have this fact somehow recognized.

We may wonder, if the forgoing is a true description of the field of rhetoric, how it has come about that rhetoric usually includes, in present-day usage, only matters of style and ornament. A modern discussion of rhetoric will often consist of chapters on diction, figures of speech, and forms of arrangement, such as antithesis, periodicity, and balance. The identification of rhetoric with persuasion seems to have vanished. This has come about through a process of substituting a part for the whole or of losing sight of the end in the means. For example, in the Middle Ages, there were centuries when there was not a great deal of public speaking, and what was done was in a formal way upon certain conventional themes. At such times, the chief care of the speaker was in the phrasing of his material. His subject-matter was always old—probably dictated down to minute details by the conventions of the occasion; his skill was to be shown in his diction and embellishment. So rhetoric came to be the study of embellishment, and is so defined in some medieval and Renaissance rhetorics. At such times, the identification of rhetoric with display is quite warranted; and we can see the ground for the prevalent meaning we noted at the beginning of the paper.

This degradation of rhetoric can be traced quite clearly. The Roman rhetoricians divided the subject into five parts; to quote Cicero's statement, the orator "ought first to find what he should say (inventio), next to dispose and arrange his matter, not only in a certain order, but with a sort of power and judgment (dispositio), then to clothe and deck his thought with language (elocutio); then to secure them in his memory (memoria); and lastly to deliver them with dignity and grace (pronuntiatio)." Aristotle devotes practically all of his first two books to the subject of invention; in the third he treats of disposition, elocution or style, and very briefly of delivery, omitting the subject of memorizing. But it is plain

that in any period when subject-matter was conventionalized, the consideration of invention would be neglected. Disposition would require only the slightest attention, whereas stylistic embellishment, memorizing, and delivery would constitute the orator's task. Some teachers of rhetoric, indeed, by the plan of having students use only the works of others, reduce the study entirely to that of the last two of the five parts—memorizing and delivery.

As we are aware, not in the middle ages alone has rhetoric thus been narrowed. In any and all times the tendency is present—the tendency to depend upon tradition or convention for material and devote oneself wholly to style in writing and delivery in speaking; so that rhetoric becomes a study of how to vary a phrase, how to turn a compliment, write certain kinds of letters and formal addresses, how to declaim great orations, or how to deliver a set speech suitable to a certain occasion. Order of words, with regard to emphasis and balance, beauty of figures, dignity and sonorousness become the matters of highest concern. Rhetoric is then an affair of the court and the chamber—or the parlor; and is brought back to its true self only when some divisive issue, a revolution or a great national danger, calls men to sterner tasks of discussion and persuasion. In these times of stress, oratorical power grows out of the subject-matter, eloquence is organic and not an embellishment or flourish added from without. Such eloquence, imbued with great earnestness of persuasive effort, has a simplicity of diction and style which, like poetry in its great periods, lies very close to the common speech of men, and yet at the same time exercises an exalting and purifying influence upon the language. Might it not be possible that in matters of purity and strength of speech the orators, the speaking men—such as Bunyan, Jeremy Taylor, Pitt, Fox, Burke, and Lincoln—have exerted as great an influence upon the language as the poets and essayists? Yet the speakers are too often overlooked when investigations are made upon these points.

But it occurs to me, as I glance back, that my subject is too large to cover even in a paper of such inordinate length as this one is about to assume. I shall attempt no formal summary, hoping that as we have travelled about this field, some of its contours have become clearer and its boundary-lines more definite. I have tried to show that in the field of persuasive discourse, which traditionally and still to a great extent practically is to be identified with oratory

and public address, we have a rather definite body of theory and practice, with an honorable history and an excellent academic pedigree. I have mentioned some distinctions that set off rhetorical discourses from all other forms, whether oral or written; notably, that in rhetoric a study of the audience is fundmental; and the essence of it is adaptation to the end of influencing hearers. Rhetoric does not include all the work done by our present departments of public speaking: it does not include the oral interpretation of literature, nor dramatics, nor studies designed to improve the pronunciation and diction of ordinary conversation. But estimated historically and by its influence upon the affairs of the world, rhetorical discourse seems the most important subject with which we have to do. In addition to all we inherit from the past, with modern researches in psychology to draw upon, with modern wielders of publicity to observe, and with the increasing use of a method for sending human speech broadcast, so that a speaker may address thousands where he once addressed scores, the significance of persuasive discourse is continually being enhanced. Surely it would be a mistake to overlook this significance, and in proportioning our emphasis I do not see how we can give any but a central position to rhetorical study.

LITERARY STUDY AS A PREPARATION FOR ORAL PRESENTATION

A. H. LANE
University of Arizona

"WE are all poets," said Emerson, "when we read a poem well." These words are not specific, but they are suggestive. What is the nature of the reader's art form? How does it rank when compared with the art form of the poet? What is involved in reading a poem well?

To read a poem well the reader must understand the thought, feeling, imagination, and personality of the author, and also express his cosmos through the subtle medium of living voice and active personality. Of course, a complete understanding and a complete expression are impossible. First, however masterful the poet may be in the use of his medium of expression, the highest reaches of his mind escape embodiment in language and hover, ill-defined, about the local habitation. At best, then, the reader can only apprehend the poet's world. Secondly, however skillful the reader may be in the employment of his medium of expression, he can never fully reveal, even as he sees it, the author's fine rapture and airy nothing. Yet as speech is more potent than written language, the reader may express better than can the poet himself the invisible will and emotion. But even with his superior medium of expression, he can never adequately shape what he has divined and what the poet has seen with his inward eye, "the light that never was on sea or land." An ideal reading, then, involves a perfect coöperation of poet and reader, a spiritual fellowship of two distinct personalities employing different mediums of expression.

This partnership results in a somewhat unique art form. It is not a collaboration like that of Beaumont and Fletcher, because these writers work with the same medium of expression; the reader and the poet use different mediums of expression. Interpreter

and author may work together, as do Maude Adams and James Barrie; yet the result is a blend of two distinct personalities and two different art forms for the attainment of a common ideal. Even when the reader is the author himself, the final effect is a blend of two art forms. Ordinarily such coöperation however desirable it may be, is impossible. The interpreter and the writer are often widely separated in time and place and are often of different race and nationality. Shakespeare and Forbes-Robertson are centuries apart, yet author and actor, each using his own art form, unite in the performance of Hamlet. Ibsen and Nazimova are of different nationalities, yet "A Doll's House" is an artistic consumation of two personalities working independently and using different mediums of expression. The dramatist presents the ideal as he sees it, and the actor presents the ideal as it appears to him, and the ultimate realization, while it is single in impression, is a splendor like that of a double star. The two personalities and the two art forms blend into a common light, and we hardly realize that there is one glory for the interpreter and another glory for the author, until we examine the final rendition through the instrumentality of analysis.

As the interpreter uses a composite art, the question arises whether he or the author is the dominant force in the final creation. Emerson makes the reader and the poet share alike. In a sense the poet is the ruling power. He determines the general progress of the thought and feeling. In another sense the reader holds supreme command. He touches the cold groundwork of the printed page as with sunlight from heaven and it leaps to life and beauty. Undoubtedly he deserves the high rank which Emerson accords him. Realizing his high calling, and knowing his art is composite and depends upon coöperation with the poet, the reader must make a two-fold preparation. To read the poem well he must understand it fully through the poet's art form and express it adequately in his own.

What steps must the reader take to master the poet's art form? He will do well to consider the form and substance of the literature to be interpreted. As form has to do with style, meter, structure, matters often studied at the expense of substance, I shall take it for granted that the reader considers these points, and dwell more particularly on what is called literary substance, and I shall limit

my discussion for the sake of clearness and brevity to a few well-known short poems. The reader who wishes to coöperate with the poet can get a full understanding of the poem only by a literary style. He must appreciate the beauty of the poem, value the picture portrayed, follow the poet's imagination, and think his thoughts after him. These stages tend to coalesce in the reader's mind, but he may separate them somewhat for conscious study, and he will do well to consider each stage in the order named.

When a reader peruses a poem, he responds to its power and beauty. "If I read a piece of literature," says Emily Dickinson, "and it makes me so cold that no fire can warm me, I know it is poetry. If it makes me feel physically as if the top of my head were taken off, I know it is poetry. These are the only ways I know it. Is there any other?" Ruskin acknowledges that the mere contemplation of a painting may please the aesthetic sense, though the beholder can render no reason for thinking it beautiful; but in reply to Miss Dickinson's question, he intimates that the first fine rapture may be deepened by study and analysis. So Mr. Southern in the February *Drama* says that "premeditated art is the true art." Study cannot add a perfume to the violet, but may it not reveal the deeper beauty of a poem? The violet has a real splendor, the poem has an ideal glory; the reader must see how the great poet has made the real element ideal. The reader must see the creative imagination at work upon the real nautilus, before he can catch the ideal beauty of Oliver Wendell Holmes' "The Chambered Nautilus." The simple shell with its lustrous coil the poet's imagination transforms into a ship of pearl sailing the unshadowed main. The reader perceives that the poet has varied what seems the natural order of life, growth, and death and adopted the sequence of life, death, and development. The reader divines that this arrangement best suits the poet's purpose and praises its appropriateness. Furthermore he perceives that the chosen order affords a vivid contrast, and that the beauty of the bark in life and development is enhanced by juxtaposition with the picture of desolation. As the reader gets an idea of the harmonious presentation of the mental processes, he apprehends the play of the poet's imagination over the whole work, grasps the inner significance that life is development, and appreciates the poem as an artistic creation of unfading beauty and joy eternal. Thus the reader views

the varied beauty of the poem. He observes it in the physical reality, admires the intellectual harmony of the composition, and rejoices in the spiritual splendor of the poet's unseen world.

After a study of the elements of beauty, the reader analyzes the picture presented to his mind. He traces the poet's imagination back to the original material. He sees that the poet's soul, out of some object of nature, incident, or experience of life, has portrayed a fairer scene than nature ever showed, a melody more haunting than minstrel ever played, a sweeter taste, a finer scent, a rarer feeling than man ever experienced. Suppose the reader is to present Tennyson's "Bugle Song." He is charmed by its beauty and attempts to describe the picture. He tells of castle and mountains, sunlight, lake and cataract, bugles, and echoes. Unless he is better than the average, he will consent to stop here and so omit the central thing in the poet's picture. If he omits the lovers, he has no more idea of what it is about than the student who read the porter's lines in Macbeth as follows: "Come in, tailor, here you can roost your goose." The reader must get the complete picture before he can coöperate with the poet and give a good rendering. When he gets the main picture clearly, the reader who understands love perceives the appropriateness of the minor images, the sunlit walls and summits, the shining lake and cataract, the bugle notes and horns of Elfland, and the rich sky of sunset. Take The "Chambered Nautilus" for further illustration. The reader beholds two coördinate pictures: the first is the ship of pearl sailing the unshadowed main, the coral reefs and sea-maids, and wreck of the vessel. This picture is completed by reference to the wandering sea. Triton's wreathed horn, deep caves, and unresting sea. Associated with the picture of the ship and the sea is the second picture of growth under the figure of dwelling, archway, and home. This sketch is filled in by such expressions as "build," "stately mansions," "low-vaulted," "nobler temple," and "dome more vast." These two pictures, one of building and the other of the ship and the sea, stand out with almost equal vividness. The reader perceives how beautifully they are woven together. In some poems there is a primary picture and a secondary, as in the Twenty-third Psalm. In others there is a single picture, as in Bryant's "Lines to a Water-Fowl." Sometimes there is a series of images as in Thomas Hardy's "In the Time of the Breaking of Nations," which

portrays a man and a horse plowing, smoke from heaps of couch-grass, and a maid and her wight, and as in Browning's little poem which describes the violet on the starved moss, the star in the stormy sky, and God's smile in a sinful world. The reader must get the complete picture, whether there is a single image or a series, and he must understand the relationship of the pictures, if he is to know fully what the poet intended to portray. He cannot value the play of the poet's imagination, unless he sees it at work upon the reality and follows it to the artistic consummation. This will lead him naturally to the poet's emotional reaction, which is the next step to be considered.

When a reader runs casually through a poem, he is likely to miss some of the subtle changes of emotion, which the poet wishes to convey. This is especially true of the highest poetry, because the author, though he cannot efface himself entirely from his work, holds his feelings in reserve. Mrs. Siddons, for example, misinterpreted, at first, the feeling of Lady Macbeth in the words, "we fail." Finally she understood the resolution of the character and pronounced the words with telling effect. This is a mere detail, but the same principle holds in the interpretation of subordinate and primary emotions of a whole character. The correct emotional response comes from patient observation and study. Let us go back to the "Bugle Song" once more for an example. If the reader misses the picture of the lovers, he will fail to get the leading emotion of love, and will very likely indulge in elocutionary bugle notes which drown out the dominant feeling and obscure the central thought. Failing to penetrate to the chief emotion, he gives at best a mere appreciation of the evening beauty and the echoes. In other words, he stresses the secondary emotions and submerges the primary. When he sees the leading picture, he lets the dominant emotion culminate at the appropriate point. Let me illustrate further from "The Chambered Nautilus." Following the picture of the ship and the sea, the reader will note how the emotion changes. He will perceive first the spirit of joy and adventure as the ship sails the unshadowed main, then a note of fear on the coral reefs, next sympathy and sorrow in the contemplation of the wreck, and finally gratitude, admiration, and love for the message of the child of the wandering sea. He will note how the feeling associated with this picture starts, develops, and bursts into climax.

Following the second picture, he detects a feeling of wonder at the silent toil, admiration, mystery, contentment, and, in the last stanza, resolution in building up the spiritual life and deep joy in the ultimate freedom of the soul.

The reader finds it hard to analyze the poet's passion. He feels it like a spell of might, and gradually understands its nature. As he reads the "Lines to a Water Fowl," he responds to the feelings of wonder, trust, solemn joy, and faith in divine Providence. If he studies "In the Time of the Breaking of Nations," he is impressed with the solemnity and eternity of the daily tasks and elemental passions of life. Perusing carefully Browning's poem of the violet, star, and God's smile, he feels a robust faith in the divine power of love to brighten the world. In the study of emotion, the reader must be patient and lend himself to the lines of the poem until they render up their secret. The poet has placed the words in *diminuendo* and *crescendo* according to the feeling within him. The reader is likely to make the discovery that beauty, and vividness of portrayal, and intensity of emotion are all crowding together for apprehension and utterance at particular points, which are stepping-stones to the culmination of the artist's creation.

The reader now comes to the last stage of his examination. What does the poet mean? Unless there is some beginning in thought, there can be no great poem. Back of the beauty, within the picture of the imagination, colored by the bursts of emotion, is the controlling purpose and will of the author. If the reader is to interpret literature well, he must penetrate the concrete representation and grasp the poet's meaning. This is sometimes hard, because the symbol often hides while it expresses the thought to be conveyed. The reader must persevere. If he fails at first, let him remember that great critics have interpreted great literature differently. It is well for him to formulate the meaning in his own words rather than to rush to notes or encyclopedias. In his search for the controlling theme, he needs to recall the chief element of beauty, the leading picture, and the characteristic emotion. May I illustrate by poems already mentioned? He wishes to know the central thought of "The Bugle Song." He recalls the picture of the lovers idealized by the poet and remembers that the dominant feeling is love. He can hardly miss the conclusion that the poet wishes to say that love endures forever. When he comes to "The

Chambered Nautilus,'' he will contemplate the two pictures which the poet has drawn. He will note the stages of life, death, and development in the first figure, and see how the picture of building carries out in a new way and emphasizes again the idea of growth suggested in the first picture. It dawns upon him that the poet's idea is, that life is a development toward the divine, or he may wish to state the thought in the words of the quotation, ''Man may rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things.'' Recalling the pictures of the man plowing and the maid and her wight, and having in mind the dominant emotion of ''In the Time of the Breaking of Nations,'' he decides that Hardy's theme must be, labor and love remain unchanged while governments wax and wane. These examples are exceedingly simple but they serve to show the steps of preparation in literary study. The principles may be applied to the great masterpiece of literature. Matthew Arnold had in mind the series of pictures in the Bible when he formulated his famous definition of God as ''the Power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness.''

I have endeavored to show that the reader who would interpret literature well has a high calling which ranks with that of the poet, that the reader must realize that his art is a composite and depends upon coöperation with the author, and that the reader can best understand the poet's aim and purpose by a literary study of the selection to be rendered, because that study enables him better to appreciate what the poet values as beautiful and what he wishes to picture, to feel, and to will. Not until the reader has penetrated the mystery of the poet's heart and mind and will, is he prepared for oral interpretation of the great masterpieces of literature. But when he has learned the author's art and wooed his spirit, he may join with them his own great art, ''mysterious speech, invisible will wrought clear in sculptured sound'' and leave a presence on the air that will not die.

EDITORIAL

SELLING SPEECHES

IN response to numerous requests, the —— —— Society is now able to announce to Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers the publication of an attractive bound volume of . . . . speeches . . . . as listed on the enclosed circular at the moderate price of $5." "Now it is your chance to get *100* Speeches for only $5.00 or you can purchase any one paper for $1.25 each. Act at once and be a leader in your community."

This vibrant call to the ambitious is addressed specifically to "Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers;" the speeches are on all sorts of subjects relating to school work and school problems; and are very considerately "rewritten during the last 12 months." So you see, fellow schoolmen and teachers, your troubles are at an end; you can make a captivating speech on any and all occasions, and it won't be the same speech your neighbor is using or that you made last year!

Here is food for thought. Something is rotten somewhere. Yet we can imagine one saying, "Surely no man of honor would buy speeches and pass them off for his own!" Waiving the issue as to what constitutes honor in a case like this, what is most intriguing about the situation is that the firm that issues this advertisement evidently knows what it is about; it is evidently selling speeches, and it seems to know whom to address in order to keep up a paying business. They seem to know their customers; it is hardly likely that they are addressing "prospects" at a hazard purely. The advertisement is headed: *To the Superintendent, to the Principal, to*

the Teacher. The appeal begins: "In response to numerous requests . . . . ;" and one must only surmise that the authors know what they are about in spending money on circularizing the teaching professsion.

Is comment needed? Could any comment in print do justice to such a situation! In what words shall one express one's contempt for the teacher or school leader who will use this method of getting into the graces of his constituents; not even to attempt to voice what one feels of a "leader" of boys and girls who will stand before them in such a cloak of hypocrisy and deceit! And yet the firm that issues this "literature" is obviously thrifty and confident.

But, stay! Maybe these superintendents, principals, and teachers have a defense; maybe they are living up to their lights, following their past training. Maybe they have cast about for proper examples and have meekly followed their own leaders. Just suppose for a minute. Imagine yourself a superintendent, principal, or teacher in this or that city. You have attended college or normal school. Also you have on your own staff someone who is coaching debates and conducting oratorical contests. When in college or normal school you had some inkling of how debates were conducted; it is quite within the bounds of possibility that you attended a college or normal school where the coach gathered the material for the debaters, arranged it for them, and then wrote their speeches. Or it may be that now in your own school is a teacher—no, a coach—who is also gathering material, arranging it, and writing speeches for debaters. Possibly he is doing the same for "orators," too. You yourself, as superintendent, principal, or teacher, have not had adequate training in speaking in your college and normal school days, because quite a few universities, colleges, and normal schools have not in the past quarter century given such adequate training. So you face the issues of your life unprepared to meet them in a forthright and efficient manner.

Yet face them you must on some terms. So what to do, what to do! There is only one easiest way; you will follow the examples you see about you. And if this happens to have been a teacher in college or normal school who gathered material, arranged it, and wrote it into speeches for debaters and orators, or if you have on your staff a coach who gathers material, arranges it, and writes it into speeches for the contestants, why, what can one expect other

than that you will lend a ready ear to the advertisement of a firm that advertises, "During the past two years, Principals and Superintendents of schools have requested us to forward various groups of speeches for use in the schools and to send bills to the school board!"

Is this picture overdrawn? Judge for yourself. The following is quoted verbatim from another advertisement, showing what coaches are doing in some places:

"THE DEBATE.
THE KANSAS INDUSTRIAL COURT.

The proposition for the high school debates this year concerns the Kansas Industrial Court. We can furnish six twelve minute speeches and forty rebuttals on the affirmative and negative of this question. These debate speeches are typewritten, and will be sent at once upon request for $2.50.

PUBLIC SPEAKING DEPARTMENT
STATE NORMAL SCHOOL,
----------, ----------
(Name of city and state)"

No record is available of the amount of sales of this enterprising public speaking department. From what one knows, though, of the practices in all too many high schools, one can make a pretty safe guess that the mimeographing bills have been quite adequately attended to by the enterprisers behind this lofty venture.

Here is a fine educational Augean stable for an ambitious Hercules. It is no stretch of language to say that it reeks to heaven. Morally it is outside the pale; what shall be said of it in terms of educational policy? Here you have it; superintendents, principals, and teachers all over the country seemingly can be found who will deny the dignity and worth of courses in speech education, either shutting it out altogether or else letting it in only as a school sport or a show venture, perverting its fine purposes and rich potentialities to mere public parade, and forbidding it a place in the curriculum where it belongs; then finding their own inefficiency in speech circularized all over the country in an advertisement that they ought to be able to say is scurrilous and libelous. But will they say it? Can they? The majority undoubtedly will be only too glad to assert it in even more vigorous language than that used here. The great majority are high above such contemptible practices; and one may venture the guess that these will be the ones who are most will-

ing to give speech education a sensible place in the school curriculum; for as sincere men they cannot help knowing that if boys and girls are taught to speak well in school, they will not be tempted later when they become superintendents, principals, and teachers. Some, misguided now, will realize that the attempt to substitute silent reading for speech training and reading aloud is just what makes grown men unable to speak in public and what makes them a possible "prospect" for the ambitious firm with speeches to sell —at five dollars a hundred.

Why have we not here the crux of the whole problem of the place of speech training in our school system? Out of this situation several theorems seem to formulate, all vital to the validity of offering training in speech in schools and colleges; here is a partial list:

1. Ability to speak is needed for effective leadership.
2. Ability to speak effectively does not come by itself as a by-product of general education.
3. Leadership gained in a special field does not qualify one to speak effectively in public, even when speaking within that field.
4. Ability to speak must be taught as a special and separate subject.
5. Compelling men to wait until they are grown and in responsible positions before discovering their ineffectiveness in speech is playing false with educational obligations.
6. Proper speech training is personality training: the only right speaking is honest, genuine, and in one's person.
7. The school administrator who cannot speak fairly to his community, yet who does not provide efficient training in speech, is a living denial of his educational doctrines.
8. The only fair solution is the extension of sound training in speech throughout the whole educational system.
9. The charlatan will prosper so long as there is a field for his enterprises.
10. The blame for charlatanry is not on those who make the best provision possible for training in speech within their respective jurisdictions.

Possibly this is teasing out moral precepts where none inhere; but inasmuch as there is probably no known way of suppressing the seller of speeches, we can at least indicate where he and his con-

stituency stand in the general scheme of things educational. He is the rash that constitutes a symptom of local disorder or, more likely, of a pathological general condition.

PERTAINING TO EDITORIAL POLICY

THE NEWS AND NOTES SECTION

A glance at the list of Editors will reveal an innovation. A group of assistant editors are commissioned to act as reporters of news and notes, and assigned to cover various sections of the country. This means that they have been asked to gather information as they may that will make interesting professional information. It means also that anyone possessing facts valuable for publication may know to whom to send them; either to the district editor or to the editor-in-chief.

This raises the question, What constitutes good copy for a section of news and notes? The answer must remain something of a mooted point; but the present administration will ask that the news be confined to strictly academic interests within the general field of speech education. With this goes the implication that the items should be confined to matters curricular and administrative chiefly; and that extra-curricular activities are distinctly secondary in this venture.

To be concrete, the items of news sought are of the following types, and about in this order of preference:

Conferences and meetings of sectional associations
New types of courses offered
The extension of graduate courses, the privilege of granting advanced degrees, the establishment of majors and minors
The setting up of laboratories and clinics
Lists of people receiving advanced degrees
Change of location of members and subscribers
Significant academic honors bestowed
The outcome of major oratorical contests
Data as to new methods of judging contests
The formation of major debating and oratorical leagues

The kind of items specifically *not* desired are:

Debate victories, minor oratorical contest returns, individual propositions for debate, in general, the gossip of contests
Individual notices of plays or dramatic productions; lists of a season's offerings are acceptable
Non-academic travel and movements of teachers
Itineraries of junketing debating teams
Notices purely personal.

Reprints

BEGINNING with this issue a change is inaugurated in the matter of reprints of articles appearing in The Quarterly Journal. Henceforth the writers of leading contributions will receive twenty-five copies of The Journal; arrangements for reprints will be made between the writer and the printer. Address the Flanigan-Pearson Co., Champaign, Illinois.

Anyone wishing reprints of articles published previous to this number should make applications to the author of the article. This holds for the February, 1923 number and all previous to that date.

On Making Up Material for a Number

The editor has got what he plead for. In his annual report at New York City he called for comment from the readers of The Journal, asking especially for suggestions for improvements and better methods. He has been getting them, freely expressed and frankly conceived. The most pointed have been in the nature of inquiries as to why such and such an article has been allowed to disgrace the pages of The Journal. Feeling strongly that the supporters of a publication have a right to know on what basis the editor chooses material, the editor makes the following statement of the rules by which he tries to be guided:

1. An article must be of interest to a considerable proportion of the teachers of speech in its various branches.

2. An article must be written in good English; that is, it must be in such form that editing it is no more than bringing it to something like a uniform standard of paragraphing, sentence structure and length, and punctuation.

3. A balance is sought among the various branches of speech training; rhetoric, speech correction, teaching methods, interpretation, dramatics, the nature of speech, voice science. Also a balance is sought among the needs of the high school, the normal school, college, graduate school, and the general interest in speech education.

4. Geographical distribution of writers is considered when possible; after the considerations named above, however.

5. An article written in a particularly pleasing style is assured of more than considerate attention.

6. Priority in receipt of material is considered.

THE FORUM

AT the annual convention of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, a motion was passed to the effect that members of state and sectional associations may become members of the National Association of Teachers of Speech without additional initiation fee or dues other than the annual subscription to THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION, which is $2.50 a year.

The treasurer would like to have the names of all such members of local organizations who are not now members of the National Association of Teachers of Speech in order that their names may be duly entered on the membership role. Officers of local associations should send a list of their members in good standing to the treasurer at once.

Following is the personnel of the Research Committee as appointed by President Gough:

Three-year term.
Professor H. A. Wichelns, New York University—Chairman.
Professor Edward Mabie, University of Iowa.
Professor A. T. Weaver, University of Wisconsin.

Two-year term.
Professor Lee E. Bassett, Leland Stanford University.
Dr. Harry Caplan, Cornell University.
Professor Charles A. Fritz, Otterbein College (Westerville, Ohio).

One-year term.
Professor Glenn N. Merry, University of Iowa.
Professor Charles F. Lindsley, University of Minnesota.
Mr. William E. Utterback, Dartmouth College, (Honover, New Hampshire).

What Is Debating For?

Dear Editor:—

Is it not time to inquire through your columns as to who are or what is responsible among us for the situation indicated by the following letter recently received here?

* * * * * * *, January 16, 1912.

Bowdoin Debating Council.
Bowdoin College.
Brunswick, Me.
Dear Sir:—

We are writing you at this time concerning the subject of the League of Nations, which we understand that you have debated it and was successful with it. As we are to debate it this year as champion debate here in our college we thought you to be the best scource of information to get the real dope on the subject, as we understand that you are the leading debating college in the United States.

We will be glad to get the speeches that you had on the subject if you have a copy of them on hand, and also any other information that you may be able to give us.

We are not asking you to give us this, but we want to buy it or borrow it if you dont want to sell it and we will return it within the next few weeks.

Thanking you for your kindness, and prompt reply, We beg to remain very truly yours.

****

Champion Debaters

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Respectfully yours
Wm. Hawley Davis

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Bowdoin College,
January 30, 1923.

A Ray of Hope As To Judges

THE vexed problem of choosing judges for intercollegiate debates, discussion of which raged so furiously in the April number of The Quarterly, is illuminated somewhat, I believe, by the recent experience of at least one institution. In the autumn of 1921, Bowdoin College, following the lead of Ripon College and others, undertook a debating tour. Moreover, believing that the time was ripe for an experiment in confidence, Bowdoin arranged

for its successive debates on a novel but surely not irrational plan. The unusual features of this plan seem to be worth stating in detail.

Bowdoin's initial proposal stated that Bowdoin would support the Affirmative on the tour. This was based upon experience in representing both sides at home and away from home, and expressed Bowdoin's conclusion from this experience that (1) there is an element of discourtesy in deliberately taking the floor and lecturing one's guests before they have had an opportunity to make themselves heard, and that (2) it is very appropriate for visitors (or invaders!) to propose a change in the *status quo.*

Bowdoin further proposed that a committee consisting of a selected alumnus from each institution and under the chairmanship of the Bowdoin representative should select the question for debate. Bowdin foresaw and risked deliberately the possibility of a combination of its opponents to secure a question weaker on the Affirmative than on the Negative.

Another feature of the plan concerned the judges. Bowdoin proposed that the choice of judges, subject to the usual provisions concerning lack of bias, should be *left to the home institution,* requesting merely that Bowdoin be notified as early as possible as to the individuals selected.

These provisions were accepted and observed by the institutions encountered on the trip—Tufts College, Ripon College, Knox College, and Syracuse University. No protests were filed at any time. Judges were not in every case reported beforehand to Bowdoin; in one case, the selection was not completed until the evening of the debate. Yet to Bowdoin, who had risked the experiments here involved, the results, with a team not known beforehand to be remarkable and certainly not superior to many other teams from here, were satisfactory; for all of the debates were awarded to the Affirmative.

I would quite agree with Professor Shaw and Professor Woolbert that these awards do not demonstrate conclusively the superior excellence of Bowdoin in debate. I submit, however, that the experience does demonstrate the debating integrity of four representative institutions distributed over a wide area. Who shall say that the method cannot spread?

WM. HAWLEY DAVIS

Brunswick, Maine
January 31, 1923.

NEW BOOKS

The Art of Acting and Public Reading. By ROLLO ANSON TALLCOTT. The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis, 1922.

The purpose of this book, as stated in the preface, is "to set forth a comprehensive classification of the different ways of presenting various types of literature, taking into consideration the author's purpose and the kind of audience to be entertained." The methods of presentation, according to Mr. Tallcott, are: acting, personating, impersonative reading and pure reading. These are classified according to "their progression from realistic presentation on the stage to the most highly suggestive presentation on the public platform." The forms of literature considered are: "the play, the monologue, direct address, descriptive dialogue, pure narration, pure description, and lyric composition." The principles by which one may determine the appropriate methods of presentation for a given selection are stated and the methods as actually applied to the various literary forms are described in detail.

In connection with acting, Mr. Tallcott discusses stage business and gives brief suggestions regarding setting, properties, grouping of characters, mechanical effects, lighting effects, make-up, and costumes. He also discusses various problems connected with rehearsing beginners. He stresses the necessity of tact and has a word to say upon everything from difficulties of egotistical students to love scenes and profanity.

Suggestions for the public reader include a consideration of such matters as the relation of voice and action to each form of presensation; the use of properties; sex limitations in reading; con-

scious imitation of voice, action, dialect, provincialisms, and sounds of nature; involuntary response to mood; singing during a reading; musical accompaniment of selections; and the use of the reading stand.

The last section of the book discusses methods of study. The most significant suggestion in this part of the text is that the order of training for actor or reader should be from the realistic to the suggestive form of the arts; that is, training in acting should come first, then training in personation, then in impersonative reading, and finally in pure reading.

The author admits that he does not hope to have his classification accepted as infallible, and certainly there are few teachers who will not wish to make some modifications. A rigid system of catagories may make for clearness but it is difficult to formulate one which fits all the facts. Because of the extreme simplification and definiteness of Mr. Talcott's classification it is not impossible to find selections which belong in none of the catagories. Some other difficulties are as follows: unkind selections involving imitation of speech defects are recommended as "one of the most popular forms" for personation; pantomime is given an unusual definition as a phase of action, but as a form of presentation it is not mentioned even in order to exclude it from consideration; some of the discussion is not only elementary but obvious; a more thorough understanding of the nature of the aesthetic attitude would improve parts of the discussion.

Nevertheless, in spite of faults, this classification and description of the arts of acting and public reading is the most ambitious, the clearest and the most thorough that we have at present. Although it is intended for advanced students in the normal school, college, and studio, it really deserves a larger audience. The principles which it presents might have prevented many readers from making themselves ridiculous in public. Moreover, if the members of college faculties were required to master the substance of the classification, it is possible that we might be asked less often to support inartistic public performances. Knowledge of Mr. Tallcott's story of the faculty wife who read Romeo and Juliet would help everyone who is interested in the welfare of literary interpretation. There is no doubt that if our students do not acquire a mastery of the principles of Mr. Tallcott's book, they cannot do first

class work as interpreters of literature, and until some one provides us with a better discussion of the subject, we can well use his book in our classes.

DAVIS EDWARDS, *University of Minnesota*

The Art of Debate. By WARREN CHOATE SHAW. Allyn and Bacon, New York, 1922.

Students and teachers of debate will find in this book a detailed, yet compact, treatment of the subject. In spite of the many excellent texts upon argumentation and debate which have appeared in the past, teachers have been universally aware that difficulties of presentation hinder the student from beginning at once the "intelligent practice of debate in conjunction with his study of theory." The present volume goes far toward obviating this difficulty. The suggested course of study in the Appendix is a distinct aid in emphasizing the opportunities for combining theory and practice, afforded by the arrangement of the book itself.

Two chapters are emphasized by the authors for their uniqueness: the chapters on *Surveying the Proof* and on *Strategy.* Concerning the system of analysis employed in the proof survey (an arrangement whereby the relations of part to part are graphically indicated by diagram), he says: "It has been tested by years of application in the class room and by many college debating teams; and it has been called by hundreds of students and college debaters the most valuable contribution for one's life work that a training in debate can give."

The chapter on *Strategy* is undoubtedly a helpful and welcome addition to the treatment of debate. It does indeed "make every reader wonder why this subject has been neglected so long by teachers and writers on debate; inasmuch as strategy is one of the most important means by which a debater demonstrates his skill."

Apart from the two chapters noted, the author claims for his book no new or startling contribution in material. Rather, the merit of the text lies in its convenient presentation of material which has long been regarded as part and parcel of the subjects, argumentation and debate. Formal calssifications of arguments and fallacies are noted and discussed, together with the kinds and

tests of evidence; but the text excels in that it maintains a proper balance between its treatment of elements and its discussion of their synthesis into the finished case. It does not devote too much time to forms for their own sake; there is no redundancy of detail. The author's desire is to arrive as soon as possible and profitable to the real subject for study in debate, the building of the case and the handling of the case to the best advantage after it is built.

Subject to that individual criticism and modification of details which every teacher will make for himself, the book honestly and ably fulfills its purpose "to furnish students with a new and reliable working-text on the art of debate, complete in every detail, yet without a single page of padding."

G. R. CRECRAFT, *Urbana, Illinois*

CROLL, MORRIS W. *"Attic Prose" in the Seventeenth Century. Studies in Philosophy.* April, 1921, pp. 79–128.

Some teachers of speech who talk much of the conversational style refer to their method as particularly modern. They fulminate against the elocutionists, and attribute all the misunderstandings of academic training in public speaking to the customs of these old-fashioned drill masters. They feel that their salvation is to be achieved by insisting upon their modernity. They seldom look to the past for a supporting tradition of simplicity and directness. Nor do they always realize that their battle is part of a very ancient warfare. This battle of styles is the subject of Professor Croll's discussion. He thus characterizes the opposing forces: "The first (style) was known as the *genus grande*. . . . Its true nature is to be broad and general in its scope, large and open in design, strong, energetic, vehement. The newer style, which appeared in opposition to this was known as the *genus humile*. A style of this general character would naturally have many particular forms. . . But the genus as a whole is properly characterized by its origin in *philosophy*. Its function is to express individual variances of experiences in contrast with the general and communal ideas which the open design of the oratorical style is so well adapted to contain. Its idiom is that of conversation, or is adapted from it, in order that it may flow into and fill up all the nooks and crannies of reality and reproduce its exact image to attentive observation."

"The history of Greek and Roman style," Professor Croll goes on to say, "is chiefly the story of the *genus grande* and the *genus humile*. Theoretically the two kinds are not hostile or exclusive of each other. Cicero is always anxiously insisting that they are both necessary in their proper places and relations to the oratory that he dreamed of as the perfection of the literary art. But in fact they almost always proved to be rivals; and different schools, even long and important literary periods, distinguish themselves by their preference for one of them, their dislike for the other."

The "decline of oratory" is usually a changing from one style to the other. Oratory has always been declining, and the student of its history refuses to be alarmed. The present trend toward the *genus humile* is merely another change in the fortunes of war. When taste changes from the complex to the simple there are always those who in their atack on the *genus grande* decry all stylistic art. They forget that any new mode of expression, however artless it may seem in contrast to a preceding period, very quickly develops a technique of its own. "Rhetoric put out at the door flies in again at the window." And it is the same rhetoric. For, to quote Professor Croll again, "there is only one rhetoric, the art of the beauty of spoken sounds. In oratory this beauty displays itself in its most obvious, explicit, exfoliated forms: in the *genus humile* in much more delicate, implicit, or mingled ones. But the forms are ultimately the same, and whatever beauty of style we find in the most subtle and intimate kinds of discourse could be explained —if there were critics skillful and minute enough—in terms of oratorical effect."

If, then, we prefer to have students develop their powers of vocal interpretation upon intimate personal essays instead of upon the Bunker Hill Oration, we are merely emphasizing different aspects of the same art. In times of stress, when we think and act as one, when the merely personal is lost sight of, and the collective aspect of our fortunes is uppermost in our minds, we have masterpieces in the *genus grande*. When conditions encourage a more intimate and individual expression, we are due for another "decline of oratory." But the art of rhetoric is employed continuously, and the historically-minded teacher will see the function of both styles, for both have their roots deep in our natures. Such a teacher may even develop a fondness for the time-honored title of professor of rhetoric and oratory.

Professor Croll sketches very understandingly the battle of styles thruout the Greek and Roman period and then sets forth clearly the story of the conflict in the seventeenth century. His scholarship is of the kind that illuminates.

E. L. H., *Ithaca, N. Y.*

Better Speech. C. H. WOOLBERT *and* A. T. WEAVER. Harcourt Brace & Co., New York, 1922.

In the preface to "Better Speech," a new text specially designed for high school pupils, the authors, Woolbert and Weaver, offer as their special aims; first, to contribute "some new definiteness of meaning and direction to the nation-wide campaign for better speech," and, second, "to enable teachers with the widest variety of training to present to classes the underlying principles of good speech, and to offer them profitable projects for training and practice."

The text is treated under the following chapter titles: Good Speech, The Four Phases of Speech, Mastering the Whole Body for Speech, Voice, Using Language in Speech, Thinking for Speech, Conversation, Public Speaking, Reading. At least two of these are new to text books in this field.

The general form and arrangement of the book contribute in no small degree to the clarity and directness which are the authors' chief objectives. The order of ideas presented is logically progressive. The discussions are simple and cogent. The illustrative material is fresh, apt, and varied, following the presentation of principles with an effective immediacy. The outline and the summary in each chapter are distinct aids to systematic procedure.

In addition to the text proper three carefully prepared appendices on "The Nature of Acting," "Directing a Play," and "Debating," offer helpful material to those who have special problems to solve.

But it is the definite yet provocative nature of the exercises and projects that forms the leading contribution of the text. Not only do these stimulate the interest of the pupil, but they afford to the teacher varied opportunities for socializing the recitation and coördinating the work of different departments in the school. The authors have been unusually successful in preserving a wholesome balance between discussion and exercises, drills, and assignments;

and in addition, "Better Speech" has been happier than most texts in securing a proper equilibrium between emphasis on mastery of the body and voice, and the necessity for correct language and clear thinking.

Although the simplicity of arrangement and clearness of presentation make the book an especially safe and suggestive guide for teachers of limited training, and the generous number of fresh and interesting exercises makes it an appealing text to those less resourceful, yet its staunchest advocates will undoubtedly be found among the more experienced and better equipped teachers who have long been looking for just such a book, sound in principle, but direct, readable, and forceful enough to appeal to the average high school boy and girl as the "real thing."

ANITA T. BATTLE, *St. Louis, Missouri*

PERIODICALS

A Survey of Recent General Educational Publications
(Edited by G. W. Gray, University of Illinois.)

Thought Presentation in Oral Reading. By Fred S. Sorrenson. *Education,* Vol. XLII, December, 1921, p. 219.

While there is not much that is new to teachers of Speech in this article, it is an encouraging sign to see things of this sort in the general educational magazines. We need more of them, in order that the work of the teacher of Speech shall be brought before educators. The whole substance of Mr. Sorrenson's article is summed up in the statement that "The initial step in satisfactory oral reading consists in efficient thought gathering and presentation. If instructors can teach the young people in their classes to get an author's thought fully and accurately, and present it truly, then the instruction has certainly been of decided value."

He takes up the matter of the study of words, which should be considered for pronunciation, facile enunciation, and clear mental reaction, together with their connotations, synonyms, and etymology. Fine distinctions in meanings make the difference between the careful and the careless speaker; and if one is to be able to express his thoughts accurately, as well as those of the author whose work he is reading, thorough acquaintance with words is necessary.

Even more than the words are the phrases or groups of words. Involved sentence structure must be studied, if one is to get the full meaning of the printed page. While the speaker may not use intricate sentences, he must be able to understand them, if he is to express the thought that he has gathered. Mr. Sorrenson gives some rules for the reading of phrases which, while they are not original, are good. One statement, however, must be taken advisedly: "Obviously grouping should be determined by the punctuation of the sentences." Emphasis and inflection are discussed at some length.

As long as this work is being handled by English teachers, articles of this nature will be of assistance in pointing out to them

some ways of getting the most from the reading of the students and of expressing the substance of what they read.

WAGONER, LOVISA C., *and* DOWNEY, JUNE E., *Speech and Will-Temperament. Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol. VII, p. 291. September, 1922.

Here are some indications of a new line of attack on the general problem of speech defects. The authors have gone at it from two angles, raising these questions: "Do different varieties of speech defectives, when given the Downey Will-Temperament Test, show any characteristic profiles?" and, "Is the graphic will-temperament test in which writing exercises are used to determine the dynamic or activity level of the subject, translatable into a vocal test in which vocal exercises are used? Will the profile obtained by these two methods resemble each other?"

If satisfactory answers to these questions can be obtained, much will have been done in getting at the bottom of the problems of speech defects. Generally the "slovenly speech of the mental defective" is "credited to his poor physical and mental tone." But there are many persons of normal mentality who have abnormal speech. Therefore, in the opinion of these experimenters, "something besides general intelligence is involved." Too often the corrector of the defect fails to take into consideration the temperament of the individual, which, at the base, is the cause of the defect. In certain persons are innate traits or characteristics which are conductive to the development of disorders. "The real problem to solve is why the complex or blocking exists."

As a result of the experiments carried on with three groups of subjects, those of normal speech, those who stuttered, and those who had at some time previously stuttered, there were some interesting indications. The authors are as yet unwilling to conclude that these are proved, but the trend of the evidence seems to be in the direction that:

1. "The individual who speaks with great deliberation or hesitancy, or in the extreme cases drawls, gives a will-temperament profile running low on speed of movement and of decision, low on motor impulse and finality of judgment, and high on interest in detail. If in addition such an individual is working at his best speed, he may, under external pressure, actually block.

2. "High speed of decision and low speed of movement often cause stuttering." In the group of students showing mild speech defects, none score beyond the median for motor impulse, while a group of college debaters all score above the median.

3. "Too great motor impulsion and speed with deficient coördination and motor control may be given the speaker who 'stumbles over himself', whose drive and speed result in chaotic presentation; or the speaker of the piercing voice or disagreeable nasality of tone."

The will-temperament tests have been translated into vocal tests, which, when applied, bear out these conclusions. We shall be glad to know the results of further experimentation and research along this line. It seems that they ought to be of not a little value to correctors of speech defects.

Psychological Monographs, Vol. XXXI, No. 1. University of Iowa Studies in Psychology, No. 8.

In this number of the Monographs are several articles that should be of interest to all teachers of Speech. To mention a few: Measurement of Acuity of Hearing Throughout the Tonal Range by Cordia C. Bunch, Visual Training of the Pitch of the Voice by Carl J. Knock, Voice Inflection in Speech by Glenn N. Merry, A Comparison of Auditory Images of Musicians, Psychologists, and Children by Marie Agnew, and several others.

The study by Professor Merry is an attempt to put in graphic form, according to scientific procedure, the results of some very thorough experiments in the matter of voice inflections. It will be discussed more fully in a subsequent number.

All teachers of voice, whether of speaking or singing, ought to keep in mind the fact that there is a close relation between hearing and speaking. The articles in the Monographs bearing on the matter of hearing are a distinct contribution, and ought to add to our understanding of this phase of the work.

British Journal of Psychology, July, 1922, p. 76.

Nony, Camille: The Biological and Social Significance of the Expression of the Emotions.

A peculiarly apt article, timely because of its direct significance in the problems of language and speech.

Educational Review, December, 1922, p. 367.

Barrows, Sarah T.: The Foreign Child and His Speech Handicap.

OTHER ARTICLES OF INTEREST TO TEACHERS OF SPEECH

Tompkins, Ernest: Supplemental Notes on the Stammering Problem. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology,* Vol. XXVII, p. 132, July–September, 1922.

Wells, F. L., and Rooney, J. S.: A Sample Voice Key. *Journal of Experimental Psychology,* Vol. V, p. 419, December, 1922.

Ruckmick, C. A.: Preliminary Study of the Emotions. *Psychological Monographs,* Vol. XXX, Number 3, 1921.

Mann, Cornelia: Failures Due to Language Deficiency. *Psychological Clinic,* Vol. XIII, p. 230, January-February, 1922.

Ide, G. G.: Spoken Language as an Essential Tool. *Psychological Clinic,* Vol. XIII, p. 216.

Lodge, Gonzalez: Dramatic Interpretation in the Teaching of the Classics. *Teachers College Record,* Columbia University, Vol. XXI, p. 217, 1921.

Smith, Laura G.: Speech Defect Resulting from Ether Shock. *Pedagogical Seminary,* Vol. XXVIII, p. 308, 1921.

REFERENCES TO MATERIAL CONCERNING STYLE IN ORAL DISCOURSE

Compiled by Charles F. Lindsley, University of Minnesota

Books

Bradbury, Harry .—The Structure of an Effective Public Speech. Greenfield, Mass.: T. Morey and Son. 1915.

Brewster, William T. (Ed)—Representative Essays on the Theory of Style. 1869.

Contents: Introduction—John Henry Newman: Literature—Thomas De Quincey: Style—Herbert Spencer: The Philosophy of Style—George Henry Lewes: The Principles of Success in Literature—Robert Louis Stevenson: Style in Literature—Walter Pater: Style—Frederic Harrison: On English Prose. List of books cited in the introduction and the notes.

(This volume is prepared from the rhetorician's point of view, and the essays in it concern the subject of literary style; but there is much value to be gained by the student interested in oral discourse).

Brink, Clark Mills—The Making of an Oration. A. C. McClurg and Co., 1913. (See chapter on "General Qualities of Oratorical Style").

Cicero—On Oratory and Orators. See Index for Style.

Cairns, William B.—The Forms of Discourse. Chapter 1, pp. 1-53.

Campbell, George—The Philosophy of Rhetoric. 1816. Books II and III treat of style.

Diderot, D.—Thoughts on Art and Style. Selected and translated by Beatrix Tollemach. London: Rivington. 1904.

Harding, Samuel Bannister—Select Orations Illustrating American History. Introduction by John M. Clapp, Oratorical Style and Structure, pp. 13–30.

Lutoslowski, W.—The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic. New York Longmans, 1807. Chapter III, pp. 64–193, The Style of Plato. Very important for bearing on stylometry.

Phelps, Austin—English Style in Public Discourse. Scribners.

Quintilian—Institutes of Oratory. See Index for Style.

Raleigh, Walter Alexander—Style. London, E. Arnold.

Shurter, Edwin Du Bois—The Rhetoric of Oratory. Chapter IV, pp. 93-166. Macmillan.

Scott, Walter Dill—The Psychology of Public Speaking. Hinds, Noble and Eldredge. (The whole book may well be read in connection with the subject of Style).

Spencer, Herbert—The Philosophy of Style. Edited with Introduction and notes by Fred N. Scott. Allyn and Bacon.

Stanley, Hiram M.—Evolutionary Psychology of the Feelings. See Chapter XVIII, Psychology of Literary Style, pp. 310–331.

Periodicals

Comparison of Cicero and Aristotle on Style. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, Vol. IV, pp. 61–71.

Covington, Harry Franklin—On Imaginative Suggestion. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. Vol. II, pp. 180-185.

Doyle, J. H.—The Style of Wendell Phillips. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. Vol. II, pp. 331-339.

Fernald, Ruth Mabel—The Diagnosis of Mental Imagery. Psychol. Mon. Vol. XIV, No. 1.

Gislason, H. B.—Elements of Objectivity in Wendell Phillips. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. Vol. III, pp. 249-264.

Gunnison, Binney—Imagination in Oratory. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. Vol. I, pp. 144-153.

Hastings, Thomas S.—The Differences between the Oratorical and Rhetorical Styles. Presbyr. Rev., Vol. X, pp. 210-219.

Keary, C. F.—Of Style. Ind. Rev., Dec. 1904, pp. 363-373.

Lay, Wilfred—Mental Imagery. Psychol. Mon. Sup. Vol. II.

Libby, Walter—The Theory of Style. Pop. Sci. Month. Vol. 76, pp. 76-85.

Lindsley, Charles F.—George William Curtis: A Study in the Style of Oral Discourse. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. Vol. V, pp. 79-100.

Henry Woodfin Grady, Orator. Ibid. Vol. VI, pp. 28-42.

A Footnote in the Psychology of Persuasion. Ibid. Vol. VII, pp

On the Difference between the Essay Style and the Style of Oratory. Christian Spec., pp. 356-363.

Rousseau, Lousene G.—The Rhetorical Principles of Cicero and Adams. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, Vol. II, pp. 397-409.

Smith, I. G.—Style. Living Age. Vol. 226, pp 93-100.

Showerman, Grant—Cicero the Stylist: An Appreciation. Clas. Jr. Vol. VIII, pp. 180-192.

Woolbert, Charles H.—Persuasion: Principles and Method. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education. Vol. V. (Three articles). pp. 12-25; 101-112; 212-238.—Speaking and Writing—A Study of Differences. Ibid. Vol. VIII, pp. 271-285.

NEWS AND NOTES

SPEECH HEARD OPTICALLY

The Speech Reading Club of Washington, D. C., is the name of an organization made up of a group of about seventy-five earnest men and women, who are partially deaf, and who have joined this organization for the purpose of cultivating lip reading. Shutting their ears and concentrating on the movement of the lips these persons hear the speech through their eyes. They must concentrate closely on the speaker and never allow their vision to linger from his mouth, for their sight has become their hearing and they are dependent on this concentrated vision for every part of the speech. A glance away would cause the hearer to lose a portion of the address.

Extra strong lights are arranged to fall on the face of the speaker, the light being arranged to reflect particularly the movement of the lips. The regular monthly meetings of this speech reading organization are arranged for the practice of lip reading, although a number of the members are able to hear very well if the speaker modulates his words well.

The Department of Speech Education at State Normal School and Teacher's College, Peru, Neb., reports:

Literary Interpretation 1 is now required of English majors and students specializing in Kindergarten.

Extemporaneous Speaking is required of English majors and of all four-year students in other departments.

For the first time the department is offering an advanced course in Public Speaking this semester.

Southwestern College, Kansas

INCREASE IN ATTENDANCE

When J. Thompson Baker began the work as head of the department last fall there were less than fifty in the entire department. Now there are over 200 enrolled.

Recognizing the increasing demand for those who can teach various forms of public speaking in both graded schools and high school, Dr. Baker announced at the beginning of his second semester a Teachers Class. Thirty are enrolled in this work, more than double what was expected. It is planned to offer similar work in the summer term of the college.

A UNIQUE COURSE

A new course is offered, perhaps out of the ordinary. It is that in "Public Speaking Problems." It is open only to juniors and seniors, and is a seminar course. Each member brings to the class his problem and presents it to the class and is permitted to discuss it, and in turn the class consider it from all angles. Thus the student attacks his own problem, the class room serving as the laboratory and the class as a critical audience. The class is limited to twelve.

MANY DEBATES

This department this year has a large schedule of debates, there being no less than eighteen inter-collegiate contests on its program. This includes both women and men's debates.

The University of California

Professor James O'Neill, of the University of Wisconsin, will teach in the Summer Session of the University of California, giving two courses; one entitled "Speech Composition," and the other entitled, "Aims and Methods in Speech Education."

Professor Albert M. Harris, Associate Professor of Public Speaking and Debate, Vanderbilt University, will teach in the Summer Session of the University of California, giving two courses; one entitled "Fundamentals of Expression and Interpretation," and the other entitled, "Extempore Speaking."

Miss Gertrude Johnson, Assistant Professor of Speech, will teach in the University of California Summer Session, giving one course in "The Advanced Interpretation of Literature," and the other, "Play Production."

The University of California carries on its Summer Session faculty in the Department of Public Speaking the name of Dr. George Miller Calhoun, Associate Professor of Greek in the University of California, who will give a course in "The Oratory of Ancient Greece."

Professor N. A. Pedersen, on leave of absence from the State College of Utah, has decided to spend another year at the University of California in pursuance of his post-graduate studies.

The friends of Professor Emerson, of Leeland Stanford Junior University, will be gratified to know that Professor Emerson has just been promoted to the Associate Professorship of Public Speaking in the same institution.

Professor Frederic N. Blanchard, formerly of the University of Chicago, is visiting lecturer in Public Speaking at the University of California this semester.

KANSAS WESLEYAN

The annual Convention and Contest of the Kansas Inter-collegiate Oratorical Association will be held at Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina, Kansas, on March 23-24. Twelve colleges are included in the State Association. The six colleges that survived the elimination contest in thought and composition are:

Washburn College	Fairmount College
Sterling College	Baker University
Southwestern College	Kansas Wesleyan University

Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina, Kansas, is this year trying the experiment of conducting a decisionless debate, two debates in which only one judge is used, and six debates in which three judges are used. It is the desire of those who are conducting the experiment to find out whether a decisionless debate will arouse interest in the student body and debaters, and also to ascertain whether or not the one-judge system proves as satisfactory for them as the old three-judge system.

Salina, Kansas, is this year introducing into the school system of the city regular courses in Religious Education. The teachers of this Day School of Religion, feeling the need of some special training in story telling and dramatics, have asked Professor Charles S. Templer, Head of the Department of Speech, at Kansas Wesleyan University, to offer them short courses in these subjects.

The request has been granted, and the first classes will meet on Monday evening, February 26th.

It has been found from the experience of the Purple Masque dramatic organization, that the general dramatic club with one degree or grade of membership is the thing for a college dramatic organization. For two years The Masque experimented with a three-degree membership, the idea being to recognize in the first degree histrionic talent and interest, and in the other degrees histrionic achievement. But it was not successful from the standpoint of practicality, and a committee is now preparing a one-degree, non-fraternal type of organization.

On February 19th, Doctor Howard T. Hill, head of the department of Public Speech at KSAC, spoke from the Kansas City Star Radio on the subject,—"The Platform and Stage in the Community." He emphasized the fundamental qualities of the activities of public speech, and urged a larger use of the community facilities for producing its own entertainment.

The Public Speech Department at KSAC has found it highly satisfactory to hold frequent required assemblies of all students enrolled in the department. At these meetings members of the department staff present problems common to the platform and stage, or authorities are invited from outside to discuss their particular specialty as it affects the work of public speech.

For the first time in the history of the department at KSAC, a course is now being offered in Dramatic Production, under the instruction of Assistant Professor Ray E. Holcombe. Practical instruction in the various phases of production is given, and students thus prepared for many of the demands which will be made upon them as teachers and as community leaders.

The Department has established, for the convenience of the communities of the state, a Play Service Bureau under the management of Mr. Ray Holcombe. A large collection of good plays is maintained at the department office, and loaned to the communities for inspection and use. A number of plays are sent to the inquirer on easy terms, and upon their return others are sent if no satisfactory one is found at first.